

METHODIST REVIEW.

(BIMONTHLY.)

DANIEL CURRY, D.D., LL.D., Editor.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
I. JOHN PRICE DURBIN, D.D., LL.D.....	329	V. OLD TESTAMENT REVISION..	421
Rev. J. A. ROCHE, M.D., D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.		Prof. HENRY M. HARMAN, D.D., LL.D., Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.	
II. THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT OF OLIVES	355	VI. THE EXALTATION OF JESUS..	439
Rev. MILTON S. TERRY, S.T.D., Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.		Rev. JOHN HUTCHISON, D.D., in the <i>Monthly Interpreter.</i>	
III. CHARLES LAMB'S ESSAYS... 382		EDITORIAL MISCELLANY:	
Rev. DANIEL WISE, D.D., Englewood, N. J.		CURRENT TOPICS.....	447
IV. THE EVANGELICAL LUTHER- AN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.....	397	FOREIGN, RELIGIOUS AND LITERARY..	452
Prof. J. W. RICHARD, D.D., Springfield, Ohio.		MISSIONARY INTELLIGENCE.....	459
		THE MAGAZINES AND REVIEWS.....	466
		BOOK NOTICES.....	475

NEW YORK:

PHILLIPS & HUNT.

CINCINNATI:

CRANSTON & STOWE.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, POSTAGE INCLUDED, \$3 50.

[Entered at the Post-office, New York, N. Y., as second-class mail matter.]

NEW THEOLOGICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS.

HISTORY OF MODERN PHILOSOPHY.

DESCARTES AND HIS SCHOOL.

By
KUNO FISCHER.
Translated by
J. P. GORDY.
Edited by
NOAH PORTER.
8vo, \$3 50.

"As done into good and clear English by Dr. Gordy, it has a combination of excellent qualities that can be found in no other similar work. It is at the same time exhaustive and not tedious, popular in the best sense of the word, and yet accurate and scholarly — a thoroughly readable, trustworthy, and improving history of modern speculative thought."—*Prof. Geo. T. Ladd.*

"He is by far the best historian of modern philosophy."—*Boston Beacon.*

CRITICAL NOTES on the International Sunday-school Lessons from the Pentateuch.

By
PROFESSOR
S. R. DRIVER,
CHRIST CHURCH,
OXFORD.
75 cents, net.
Flexible cloth.

In these expository notes the English reader is, for, perhaps, the first time, put in possession of the results of the best scholarship of our day in the widest sense, bearing upon the critical study of the Pentateuch.

Professor Driver is one of the most eminent of modern Hebrew scholars, and in this book he has presented the conclusions to which the higher criticism has led many of our soundest scholars. His position is not extreme, and there is nothing to offend a reverent student of the Bible, though there is much that will be new to most readers.

REALISTIC PHILOSOPHY Defended in a Philosophic Series.

By
JAMES MCCOSH.
2 Vols., 12mo.
1. EXPOSITORY.
2. HISTORICAL
AND CRITICAL.
Each, \$1 50.

"This work is not unlikely to prove in the end the most useful popular service which Dr. McCosh has rendered to the cause of right thinking and to sound philosophy of life."—*The Independent.*

"Its style is so clear and direct, its presentation of the whole subject is so natural and forcible, that many persons who habitually ignore discussions of abstract topics would be charmed into a new intellectual interest by giving Dr. McCosh's work a careful consideration."—*N. Y. Observer.*

OLD FAITHS IN NEW LIGHT.

By
NEWMAN
SMYTH.
NEW
EDITION.
12mo, \$1 50.

"We speak strongly about this book, because we think it exceptionally valuable. It is just such a book as ought to be in the hands of all intelligent men and women who have received an education sufficient to enable them to read intelligently about such subjects as are discussed herein."—*The Congregationalist.*

THE SELF-REVELATION OF GOD.

By
SAMUEL HARRIS,
PROFESSOR OF
SYSTEMATIC
THEOLOGY
IN YALE
UNIVERSITY.
8vo, \$3 50.

"We do not know a better work among recent publications than this one for building up old hopes and giving a new strength to one's faith. The book is thoroughly evangelic, fresh, and well wrought out. It is a valuable contribution to our American theology."—*Bishop Hurst, in North-western Christian Advocate.*

"The extent of literary, philosophical, and theological learning which the work displays is remarkable. The style is vigorous, luminous, finished, and sometimes brilliant."—*Boston Daily Advertiser.*

THE MESSIANIC PROPHECY. of the Fulfillment of Redemption through the Messiah.

By
CHARLES
AUGUSTUS
BRIGGS,
PROFESSOR
OF HEBREW
IN UNION
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY.
Cr. 8vo, \$2 50.

"It is second in importance to no theological work which has appeared in this country during the present century."—*The Critic.*

"It has been worth while to commend this book at some length to the attention of Bible students, because both the subject and the treatment entitle it to rank among the very foremost works of the generation in the department of Exegetical Theology."—*The Evangelist.*

"In it we have the first work on Messianic Prophecy which stands on the level of modern biblical studies. We commend it not only to ministers but to intelligent laymen."—*The Independent.*

CREED AND CHARACTER.

By
CANON
H. S.
HOLLAND.
12mo, \$1 50.

"The sermons are fresh, full of energy and life, and entirely free from that foreign or extraneous matter which is affected by the most popular and most applauded preachers. They are models of pulpit oratory, and deserve the hearty attention of our American pulpit and pews."—*Boston Beacon.*

"The sermons are earnest, helpful reading; portions here and there to be read and re-read; full of faith and goodfellowship, and the beauty of holiness."—*Church Union.*

SOME PROBLEMS OF PHILOSOPHY.

By
ARCHIBALD
ALEXANDER,
PROFESSOR OF
PHILOSOPHY
IN COLUMBIA
COLLEGE.
12mo, \$1.

"A work of real timeliness and value. For clearness and profundity of thought, deftness of presentation, and lucidity of style, Professor Alexander's book is not surpassed by any philosophical work of similar scope in the language."—*Science.*

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, PUBLISHERS, NEW YORK.

etter
ions
old
ngth
e is
and
alu-
teri-
rst,
ian

ilo-
arn-
s is
gor-
and
ton

ion
nent

e to
has
ring
The

e to
ome
ible
ub-
e it
most
the
col-

ork
ich
ern
end
to
de-

full
ely
ne-
by
ap-
ure
and
of
s."

est,
ere
ad ;
ip,
—

and
ro-
of
ook
ilo-
ope



METHODIST REVIEW.

MAY, 1887.

ART. I.—JOHN PRICE DURBIN, D.D., LL.D.

WHEN one has well and nobly served his generation by the will of God, Christian affection and admiration demand that we gather up the facts that made him illustrious, and thus impress lessons of wisdom upon those who survive.

As no man "liveth to himself," so "no man dieth to himself." The noble acts of our predecessors may lure us from paths of indolence, and awaken a just ambition to receive their spirit and reproduce their deeds. Of such a one we have now to write. Few men in any Church have occupied so many important positions and filled them with such advantage to the cause of Christ as the subject of this article.

JOHN PRICE DURBIN was born in Bourbon County, Ky., October 10, 1800. His parents were Methodists. His grandfather was a pioneer of our Church in Kentucky. The early life of our subject was spent on a farm. When fourteen years old he was apprenticed to a cabinet-maker, with whom he remained three years. He then worked one year at his trade. In his eighteenth year he was converted. While hesitating about joining the Church he was impressed with the duty of preaching. A week after he joined the Church he was licensed by the Quarterly Conference to preach, and the presiding elder at once sent him to Limestone Circuit. Such action showed remarkable confidence in his character and talent, and also illustrates the practices of the times. From his vehemence in delivery his voice and health failed him. He left his circuit and returned home, and his ministry seemed brought to a close.

Then, as advised, he visited the cabins of the colored people and *talked* religion to them. He did so, and in six months his voice could fill the largest house, and soon after he resumed regular work. In 1820 the old Western Conference was divided, and that year he became a member in the Ohio Conference, and was sent to Greenville Circuit. It contained about one hundred and fifty members, and extended two hundred miles through a wilderness where the red man still roved. From August, 1819, to August, 1820, he received a salary of less than fifty dollars. His education was exceedingly limited. He had learned something in a district school, but his real education began when he entered the ministry in Ohio. During the day he pursued his study in the saddle or the forest; at night, in the cabins where he stopped. He read Wesley's and Fletcher's works, and even transcribed much of Clarke's Commentary. While stationed at Lawrenceburg, Ind., in 1821, he undertook the study of English grammar with the help of his associate on the circuit, Rev. James Col-lard, afterward of the Methodist Book Concern at New York. Of this fact Dr. Durbin often spoke, confessing his great indebtedness to his junior colleague. In a short time, by the direction and aid of Dr. Martin Ruter, he commenced the study of Latin and Greek. In 1822 he was ordained deacon and sent to Hamilton and Rossville. This was about twelve miles from Oxford, the seat of Miami University. Despite the opposition of his official members he entered it as a student. He went on Mondays and returned to his charge on Fridays. In 1823 he was sent to Zanesville, O. In 1824 he was ordained elder and stationed in Lebanon, O. Here again he had the help of the scholarly Ruter. In 1825 he was appointed to Cincinnati and entered the Cincinnati College, where he was encouraged in his course by Gen. William H. Harrison, afterward President of the United States. He completed his studies, and as a special reward of diligence and scholarship received at once the degree of "Master of Arts." Thus amid the toils and cares and changes of the itinerancy he secured a college course, was graduated, and laid the foundation of his future reputation in the department of education.

The richest resources of man are in himself, and their depth and fullness are never so revealed as when, under the pressure of adverse circumstances, he is roused to the most vigorous and

persistent effort. A great soul may show its impatience of restraint, but difficulties do not conquer conviction. There are great possibilities, both of success and failure, in all great natures, and it is for their possessors to determine whether difficulties shall destroy or develop them; whether they shall be as water to extinguish the fires of genius, or as wind to fan them to a flame. Young Durbin knew that the college would help him in the purposes of a sanctified ambition, and therefore he availed himself of its advantages, in spite of difficulties. We speak of self-made men. None are great who are not *so* made. No one receives enough from ancestry or environments to make him *truly great*.

After seven years in the regular ministry, at the age of twenty-five he was elected Professor of Ancient Languages in Augusta College, Ky. Here he continued two years, and when his health failed he accepted the agency for the college, and in that work first came east. This he did also a second time, when his visit revealed the might of his eloquence. Although his early labors were thought by some persons to give no promise of future usefulness, and one of the fathers went so far as to say, "He may as well go home, as there is not much in the young man," only a short time elapsed before it was seen that there was a great deal in him.

As his ability became known he was requested by the presiding elder to preach at a camp-meeting near Lebanon, O. The occasion was greater than he had supposed. The day came, and the preacher pondered his theme and asked God to prepare his heart. The plan was formed and his mind was filled with the subject. He returned to the preachers' tent, and was "lying upon the straw," as if he had already learned one of the most important lessons in connection with pulpit preparation; namely, to allow the intellect *rest* before it makes the greatest effort. The elder seeing him at ease said, "John, are you ready to preach to the crowds that are pouring in to hear you?" "This," said he in after life, "gave me the first intimation that any would come twenty miles to hear me," as he was told they were then doing. The result of that sermon is not yet forgotten. Preachers and people were in transports. None came too far, nor did Durbin study too long to prepare, nor rest too long to deliver, that discourse. While yet in the West he was requested to

preach at another camp-meeting. He was impressed to deliver a sermon on the deity of Christ. His mind and heart were full of the subject. It took possession of him. Awed by his theme and stirred by the demands of the occasion, he entered upon his duty with faith in God. There was nothing vague in his thoughts—nothing dubious in his language—nothing indifferent in his manner. His expressions were vigorous, his convictions profound and active. Sentence after sentence shot forth with convincing force, and the strength of every opposing argument was broken. He brought his proofs from two worlds. He showed the infinite attributes of Jehovah, as illustrated by Christ in time, and Christ's own glories as the Son of the Highest, "God manifested in the flesh," and now seated with the Father on his throne, with the redeemed casting their crowns at his feet and saying, "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created."

The reputation then and afterward gained rested upon nothing meretricious or sensational, but upon the wise, the weighty, and the eloquent presentation of essential truth. The people who were so impressed were not strangers to able and popular preaching. It was the West, the country of William Beauchamp, of Russel Bigelow, of William B. Christian, of David Young, and of Samuel Parker. It was the land of James Quinn and James B. Finley and William H. Raper, men of might, among whom John P. Durbin rose and stood the acknowledged prince. And such was the reputation gained in those years that, whenever in after years he visited the West, people of all Churches and conditions flocked to his ministry and sat with rapture under his discourses.

In 1829 he was nominated to the chaplaincy of the United States Senate. There was a tie vote, and John C. Calhoun, President of the Senate, gave the casting vote against him. On receiving additional information he regretted his action, and sent for Mr. Durbin and apologized, and some of the political friends of Calhoun told him he had made the mistake of his life. Mr. Calhoun assured Mr. Durbin he voted for the other candidate only because he was a minister of the same Church to which his mother belonged.

The next year Mr. Durbin was elected to the place. It was in the days of Clay and Webster and Benton, and his ministry was not only commended for the eloquence that obtained for him the chaplaincy, but for its "pungency and power." It made an impression on the people of Washington that many years did not efface. His sermon in the Capitol on the centennial of Washington's birthday was regarded as one of his most successful efforts.

In 1830 he returned to Augusta College as Professor of Languages. In 1832 he was elected Professor of Natural Sciences in the Wesleyan University at Middletown, Conn., which position he declined. Early the same year he was, by the General Conference, elected Editor of *The Christian Advocate and Journal*. While editor his literary taste, his mental endowments, and his Christian spirit gave a paper worthy the Church that assigned him the place.

In 1834 he was elected to the presidency of Dickinson College, which had just come into Methodist hands from the Presbyterian Church. For a time it had been under the charge of that prince of Presbyterian preachers, Dr. John M. Mason. But despite the erudition, eloquence, and experience of Dr. Mason the college finally failed. Dr. Durbin was by a "unanimous and enthusiastic vote elected" under the Methodist reorganization. He accepted the post as one of duty. It is just to history to say that as editor his salary was only one thousand two hundred dollars, and Dr. Durbin said he was unable to live on it. When complaint is made of the high salaries of some of our most distinguished preachers and officers in the Church, it were well to ask if any in our ministry lose more financially than do those whose talents elsewhere would secure them double the support they receive.

If it is instructive and salutary to watch the progress of mind in its struggle upward to the goal, it should not yield less interest and pleasure to witness its achievements when it has attained the place for the full exhibition of its powers and skill; to know that past efforts are rewarded by the grandeur of present results.

Dr. Durbin was now in a most responsible, not to say critical, position. He was but thirty-four years old. Dickinson was among the earliest of our colleges. With us they had not been

popular. This institution, with ablest men, had failed under the great Presbyterian body. Dr. Durbin, though a graduate, was a Methodist preacher; his training had been in the itinerancy; and for such a man under the circumstances to hope for success shows no little faith and determination. It required a great heart and uncommon capabilities to engage with wisdom in this work. But he at once showed himself master of the situation. He was remarkable for his knowledge of men, as is shown by the character of those whom he secured for the various chairs of the institution. At the beginning of his presidency, Robert Emory was elected Professor of Ancient Languages. He had graduated at Columbia College, New York, with the first honors, and perhaps no man of his age in our history was of greater weight and worth than this honored son of Bishop Emory. He was elected president when Dr. Durbin resigned. Rev. John McClintock, who was a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, was elected Professor of Mathematics, and it was said his education fitted him for any chair in the college. William H. Allen, graduate of Bowdoin, who was subsequently and for many years the distinguished President of Girard College, was called to the chair of Chemistry and Natural History. Merritt Caldwell, also a graduate of Bowdoin, was Professor of Metaphysics and Political Economy. Who will wonder that with such a faculty Dickinson College at once obtained sympathy and support? The sagacity of the president was as manifest in the conduct of the institution as in the selection of men. By his prudence and suavity he maintained discipline, as he imparted to the students a self-respect that was a glory to Dickinson. Sympathy in the patronizing Conferences induced many of the ministers to subscribe for its pecuniary needs, and in every way the president sought the improvement of its finances.

Notwithstanding the prejudice in many minds at that day against colleges for the Church, he attained an annual collection through the Conferences, and secured the appointment of Charles Pitman and Edmund S. Janes as agents for the Philadelphia Conference, to travel through its bounds and obtain subscriptions to aid the rejuvenated institution. Ministers of the best talent were secured for the same purpose in the Baltimore Conference, to achieve like results. To accomplish

this when these ministers were in the greatest demand in the strongest churches required no little influence. He appealed to the Legislature of Pennsylvania, and received from year to year an appropriation of \$1,000. Members of Conference sometimes said the President of Dickinson did not know their trials. Once he replied, "If the brother thinks I know nothing of the difficulties of his life I shall be pleased at a proper time to exchange notes with him on ministerial privations."

To Dickinson College Dr. Durbin gave what he called eleven of the best years of his life, and while through its entire history it has done noble work for the Church, its friends fail not to recall the days of his connection with it as a palmy period.

Some of the finest scholars and most eloquent ministers came thence under Dr. Durbin's administration. Not to name laymen that have made their impress at the bar or on the bench, in the American Congress, in different professions and positions, the Church can boast in the pulpit the names of Rev. T. V. Moore, of Richmond, Va., of Bishop Bowman, Dr. Charles F. Deems, and Dr. George R. Crooks. After eight years of confinement to college duties, he deemed it desirable to have relief from his cares, and also leisure to increase the stores of his knowledge by travel. In 1842 he went abroad. On returning from his tour he published in 1844 his *Observations in Europe*, principally France and Great Britain (2 vols., 12mo); also, shortly after, *Observations in Egypt, Palestine, Syria, and Asia Minor* (2 vols., 12mo). These books are written with excellence of style, fascination of narrative, philosophic breadth and vigor of statement that commend them to the intelligent and thoughtful reader. They met with a most flattering demand.

Dr. Durbin was delegate to the memorable General Conference of 1844. No fact of his history is more worthy of notice and commendation than his heroic conduct in that great crisis. The case of Bishop Andrew had precipitated upon the Church a difficulty that it had not anticipated, and though the bishop expressed readiness to resign his office, his Southern friends forbade him. For successive weeks this was the burning question of the body. The strongest ministers delivered their greatest speeches in the debate. Bishop Soule, though originally of the North, had lived and performed most of his episco-

pal labors in the South. He was a preacher of great ability, and was remarkable for personal dignity. When Robert Newton, as delegate from the Wesleyan body, attended the General Conference in Baltimore, in 1840, and delivered his farewell words, he expressed the wish that Bishop Soule be sent as delegate. The selection was made accordingly, and Bishop Soule chose the late Dr. T. B. Sargent as traveling companion, and two years later went to England in his official character. His preaching received great commendation. In person and manners he was compared to the Duke of Wellington. He was the first bishop sent in this relation. The high honor rendered him at home and abroad would naturally add to the influence of his office and give weight to his opinions and deliverances.

At the opening of the debate concerning Bishop Andrew's case, Bishop Soule, who was in the chair, suggested that they "use soft words and hard arguments." After this he took what he called a favorable moment to offer to the Conference a few remarks before final action on the subject pending before the Conference. His remarks were neither few nor feeble. They were multiplied, direct, and vigorous, making large claims for the episcopacy, and denying the power of the General Conference over the case in hand. Dr. Durbin rose to reply, and expressed the embarrassment of the hour, but stood in the serene dignity of conscious right. His mien was modest, but his courage was commensurate with his convictions, and no dignity of office or weight of character on the part of an opponent deterred him from duty. Besides, he was from a Conference that contained slave-holding territory. He was president of a college that from the South derived much of its patronage. Four out of the six delegates from his Conference sympathized and voted with the South, and only one, the late Bishop Scott, stood with him. His was a "border Conference," the whole of the State of Delaware, and the eastern shore of Maryland and of Virginia being included. No harder battles were fought in the division of the Church than on that ground. But he was intent on his purpose. Though one of the most prudent men, he squarely met the issue with Bishop Soule, and gave him "soft words and hard arguments"—arguments certainly *hard enough*, exposing the error of the bishop

by the highest authorities of Methodism and by the most forcible logic. He said :

It has been maintained here that the General Conference has no power to remove a bishop, or to suspend the exercise of his functions, unless by impeachment and trial in regular form for some offense regularly charged. If this be true, I have greatly misunderstood the nature of our episcopacy. From whence is its power derived? Solely from the suffrages of the General Conference. There, and there only, is the source of episcopal power in our Church. And the same power that conferred the authority can remove it if they see it necessary. . . . The Minutes of 1785 declare that at the organization of the Church the "episcopal office was made elective, and the elected superintendent or bishop amenable to the body of ministers and preachers." Coke and Asbury's notes to the Discipline assert that the bishops are "*perfectly subject* to the General Conference; their power, their usefulness, themselves, are entirely at the mercy" of that body. Again, sir, I bring you the authority of a witness sanctioned by the Conference of 1792 and by Bishop Asbury, and whose doctrine is indorsed by our late beloved Bishop Emory. . . . The Rev. John Dickins, the most intimate friend of Bishop Asbury, in a pamphlet published in 1792, with the sanction of the General Conference, thus answered a question put by Mr. Hammett in reference to this very point. "Now who ever said the superiority of the bishops was by virtue of a separate ordination? If this gave them their superiority, how came they to be removable by the Conference?" "We all know Mr. Asbury derived his official power from the Conference, both before and after he was ordained a bishop, and he is still considered as the person of their choice by being responsible to the Conference, who have power to remove him and fill his place with another if they see it necessary. And as he is liable every year to be removed, he may be considered their annual choice." Bishop Emory states that this may be considered as expressing the views of Bishop Asbury in relation to the true and original character of Methodist Episcopacy, and gives it the sanction of his own authority, by quoting and using it in the twelfth section of the *Defense of our Fathers*.*

In the speech of Dr. Durbin the *orator* as well as the logician appeared. As he drew toward a close, he exclaimed :

O! sir, when we were left to infer this morning, from the remarks of the chair, that the passage of this substitute would affect not only Bishop Andrew, but perhaps others of our bishops, I could not but feel that a momentary cloud gathered before my eyes to dim the clearness of my vision. The feelings which that remark excited were not calculated to give greater freedom to the action

* Journal of General Conference, 1844, pp. 174-76. (Appendix).

of my reason, or greater precision to my judgment. But, strong as were and are those feelings, they cannot stifle my conscience or darken my understanding. I have read in the public reports of the proceedings during my absence some things that gave me great pain. Mention has been made here of proceedings at law—of the possibility of obtaining an “injunction” upon the Book Concern, and stopping our presses. I am sorry such words have been uttered here. Perhaps such an injunction might be issued. I do not know but a judge or chancellor might be found (though I do not believe it) wicked enough to rejoice in our difficulties and exult over our strife. Ah, sir, wicked men would indeed exult in it! Satan would exult in it. Perhaps, I say, such an injunction might be obtained, but what then? You may lay an injunction upon types, and presses, and newspapers, but, thank God! no injunction can be laid upon an honest conscience and an upright mind. The Book Concern! There is no man here, I am sure, whose soul is so mean and paltry as to be influenced by such a motive. Sir, that Book Concern was burned down *once*, and I grieved over its destruction; but gladly would I see it destroyed again this night—gladly would I welcome the first flash of light that might burst into that window, even though in the conflagration buildings, types, presses, paper, plates, and all were this night to be destroyed—if it could place the Church back where she was only six months ago.

Afterward, as chairman of the committee consisting of J. P. Durbin, George Peck, and Charles Elliott, to reply to the protest of the Southern delegates made by their committee through Dr. Bascom as chairman, Dr. Durbin declares:

The doctrine [advocated in the “Protest”] is novel and dangerous in the Methodist Church, that such difficulties cannot be corrected unless the person objected to be formally arraigned under some specific law, to be found in the concise code of the Discipline—doctrine not the less dangerous because it is applied where “objections” unimportant in others might be productive of the most disastrous consequences.*

The speech of Dr. Durbin and the answer to the “Protest,” together with that most powerful and convincing speech of Dr. L. L. Hamline, have gone into our history as the most intelligent vindication of our economy; and the action taken shows the inflexible purpose of the denomination to keep its episcopacy clear from the evil of American slavery, though at so great a cost as the division of the body.

The Methodist Episcopal Church has passed through three periods of great perplexity and peril. The first in 1792, when

* General Conference Journal, 1844, p. 235 (Appendix).

James O'Kelly made a schism. Then John Dickins was a power to preserve. In 1828 occurred the conflict out of which the Protestant Methodist Church arose. And in 1844, because of the decision in the case of Bishop Andrew. It was the glory of the Church in 1828 that Dr. John Emory and Dr. Thomas E. Bond were equal to her defense; nor can the time ever come when the Church will forget the service rendered her in 1844 by L. L. Hamline and J. P. Durbin. The difficulty of 1792 was a *burning fever*; the secession of 1828 was a *lancinating pain*; but Bishop Andrew's case in 1844 rent the body and covered the Church with enervating gloom. But Drs. Hamline and Durbin then threw around our economy a breastwork of argument that the heaviest artillery failed to impair.

That Dr. Durbin then only forty-four years old, should have had the position of chairman of the most important committee of the General Conference where there were also such men as Alfred Griffith, J. B. Finley, J. F. Wright, Peter Akers, William H. Raper, J. B. Stratten, Fitch Reed, C. W. Ruter, P. P. Sandford, G. Pickering, Stephen Olin, and Nathan Bangs—that amid such mighty men he should have such responsibility laid upon him, and that he performed his part so satisfactorily, is one of the clearest proofs of his exalted reputation and of ability justifying the confidence reposed in him.

In 1845, having resigned the presidency of Dickinson College, he returned, after the absence of twenty-five years, to the pastorate, and was stationed at the "Union," Philadelphia. Some believed that for his reputation this was a mistake. He had been in great demand on special occasions, and his sermons, addresses, and lectures had made him a peerless preacher. It was thought impossible to sustain himself with two sermons every Sabbath. He had said that no man should be expected to preach more than once a day to the same congregation. Two such as he preached on extra occasions no man could deliver. They were often an hour and a quarter, or possibly an hour and a half, in length, and with a physical expenditure as well as mental tax that would break down the strongest man. On entering upon this charge he displayed the practical wisdom that distinguished him in every place. This was shown in the disposition of his time, in the devotion of his talents, and

in the direction of his resources to the best results. There was a ready recognition of all departments of his work, and he addressed himself to every duty with an interest and energy that assured success. From the beginning to the end he commanded a congregation that filled and thronged the church, and his sermons were regarded as incomparable in excellence and power. He was also conscientiously faithful to all the duties of a pastor. He would have necessary time for his studies, and if disturbed would appear and stand, and, if no business was expressed, ask: "Is there any thing I can do for you?" If there was no duty in the call there was one in his study, and he resumed it. To be able to deliver two sermons to please and profit the people, as well as to dispose with judgment his material, he cut his sermons down to fifty minutes, and divided *one day into two* by retiring after the morning sermon, just as he did at night, and took such rest as nature demanded, that he might come to his work at night with the freshness of the morning. These sermons were listened to by many students of the university and medical colleges, as well as by his own people, with delight and profit. He delivered special discourses to young men, and was honored in seeing many of them come into the Church, of whom quite a number entered the ministry. An extensive revival followed his preaching, and he was loved as well as honored.

He was full of work. His character as a preacher was maintained, while as a student he was constantly making valuable accessions to the stores of his knowledge. He kept himself up in the literature of the day, and in all his reading was the thinker and the critic. The physiologists have a theory that the human body so changes in every seven years as to present a new one; so Dr. Durbin gained enough knowledge every seven years to make another great man. The first seven years of his ministry raised the uneducated youth to the professor of languages; other sevens were appropriated with equal judgment. He could not live without work. No day was too cold and no storm too heavy to prevent his preaching sermons that filled the people with rapture. The same wisdom of conduct and grace of intercourse that had distinguished him in college relations marked his intercourse with the people. His plans were accepted as his ministry was commended and

sought. Having served the "Union" the full period, he was appointed to "Trinity" in Philadelphia. Here he sustained the same reputation. In the outer world he was known by his eloquence in the pulpit, on the platform, and wherever he appeared. Besides the studies for the improvement and better furnishing of his own mind, he was in his own house as a professor to his children, training them in their studies and giving them the results of his observation and skill. During his pastorate in the city, amid the pulpits of Albert Barnes, Dr. Stephen H. Tyng, Dr. G. W. Bethune, and Dr. Thomas H. Stockton, he was an ascendant attraction. Amid such popular lecturers as Judge Conrad, Morton McMichael, and Joseph R. Chandler, he commanded an eminent place. His pastorate in Philadelphia did not impair his reputation as a man of mental and theological resources, nor was his eloquence in less repute. At the end of four years in the pastorate he was appointed presiding elder of the North Philadelphia District. The position was not pleasant to him, but his great sermons were an untold power. One on "The Resurrection," preached at the Attleborough Camp-meeting, is still spoken of as overwhelming in its effects. At this time it was well understood that one of the strong churches of another denomination in the city was making vigorous efforts to secure him as pastor. He remained but one year on the district as presiding elder. His intercourse with people and preachers was respectful and conservative; if need demanded, he was tender to the young and the erring.

In 1850, on the failure of the health of Dr. Pitman, Corresponding Secretary of our Missionary Society, the bishops unanimously called Dr. Durbin to fill the vacancy. The General Conference of 1852 elected him to this office, and successive General Conferences continued him there till 1872, when bodily infirmities necessitated his resignation. To this position Dr. Durbin came in his physical vigor, his mental strength, and in the full knowledge and discipline of all his powers. His executive ability, superior judgment of men, as well as his remarkable eloquence, commended him to the Church as a most suitable person for this high office. By travel in foreign lands he had added to his intellectual resources, and become familiar with the moral wants of the world. The place was

most congenial to his tastes. He entered upon his work with the force of conviction and the inspiration of hope. He formed his plans, adopted his policy, and, as far as possible, reduced every thing to system. He called to his support competent men, and exercised a supervision at once general and minute. His alertness was equal to any exigency, his oversight often seemed like prescience. He impressed pastors with the obligation of enlightening and inspiring our people. For this he urged monthly missionary concerts for prayer and the diffusion of appropriate literature. He insisted that with such zeal and effort the people would be educated to giving. He guarded against spasmodic action as sure to *react*; he discouraged collections at the Annual Conferences, exhorting the preachers to give with their people, that their charges might have both the inspiration and credit of their offerings. He organized auxiliary societies, and directed streams to the proper treasury.

In the public anniversaries he made it a study to put the greatest amount of matter in the smallest space, and to render it the most vital. The addresses on these occasions were such as gave the broadest views and the brightest prospect. They increased liberality and awoke a higher ambition. He studied every question of the foreign work in its relation to country, government, and race. He considered the obstacles and the inducements to missionary service. With the statesman he was the statesman ecclesiastic, wisely presenting the condition, showing the triumphs, and securing the protection that the comity of nations demands. In the monthly meetings of the Board of Managers, and in the committees on various mission fields, he showed his perfect grasp of all details and knowledge of the cases to be considered. Himself the center of intelligence, he threw light on every subject. His reports to the Board were so clear and just as to allow little discussion, as they carried with them the force of a logical statement and of an inevitable conclusion. In the Board were business men and ministers accustomed to independent thought and expression, but it was difficult to make an issue with the secretary. But who can tell his service to the Church in his keen discrimination of character, his ready perception of the qualification of candidates for the diverse fields, the education demanded, the

abilities possessed, the grace enjoyed, and the subjection to discipline required? His correspondence with them in the work, his recognition of their cases, his estimate of their difficulties, his generous judgment of their mistakes, the sympathy he expressed in their sorrows, his words of cheer in their successes, and his perpetual anxiety to succor and strengthen—these are beyond the power of words; while loyalty to the interest that he was to guard and direct compelled a strictness that is the offspring of inflexible integrity.

With a heart so full of the cause, it was natural that he should wish to visit the missions that he might better understand their needs. The society approved his proposition. He went, and made such observations and reached such conclusions as were of permanent profit. He lived, he wrote, he gave addresses, preached sermons, and kindled his own ardor in hearts as cold as icebergs. Parsimony unlocked its coffers, and mines of unbroken breadth were discovered. Many a saint nearing the celestial city remembered in his will the cause that would "bring many sons unto glory." Churches felt their dignity increased by the munificence of their offerings, and the Philadelphia Conference, of which Dr. Durbin was a member, became, and continues to be in its collections, the banner Conference.

What character, what church, what Conference could be cold when he showed the "sizes of the views?" Will the spectacle ever vanish? Will the reasons ever cease to operate?

Under his administration the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society was organized, and received his sanction and support; thus securing to the cause the benefit that has come through its intelligent adaptation of labors to the ends proposed. When he entered upon this office the Methodist Episcopal Church had a mission in Liberia, and had just established one in China. Under him its missions were extended into China, India, Germany, Switzerland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Bulgaria, and Italy. When he took his place as secretary the receipts of the society were \$100,000 a year, but before he retired they had increased sevenfold.

To this sublime work Dr. Durbin gave twenty-two of the best years of his life. He came to it in the ripeness of his intellect, the maturity of his wisdom, and in the height of his fame. If ever his unreserved powers were given to an interest

they were to this. When, in 1852, much was said about making him bishop, he expressed his conviction that another work had superior claim on his energies, and one that he preferred.

From its origin Methodism has been distinguished for the ability and popularity of some of its preachers. But in the first quarter of this century *three ministers* arose whom we may denominate the triumvirate of eloquence in the Methodist Episcopal Church: Bascom, Summerfield, and Durbin. Of the eloquence of Bascom it was said by one, himself a remarkable genius, "The model of his sermons is not found in libraries of the world. He is a pure original. His shining dims no other star; he is the solitary star that fills with a flood of effulgence the skies of his own creation." Of Summerfield we may speak in the language that Izaak Walton employed to describe Dr. Donne: "He was a preacher in earnest; weeping sometimes for his auditory, sometimes with them; always preaching to himself like an angel *from* a cloud, but *in* none; carrying some, as St. Paul was, to heaven in holy raptures, and enticing others by a sacred art and courtship to amend their lives; here picturing a vice so as to make it ugly to those that practiced it, and a virtue so as to make it beloved even by those who loved it not; and all this with a most particular grace and an inexpressible addition of comeliness. His life was a shining light." Between Bascom and Summerfield as preachers there was a great contrast. Bascom was all grandeur, Summerfield was simplicity, pathos, and a flowing stream of silvery eloquence. Durbin was unlike them both, but had some of the elements of each. What was said by the English poet Dryden, in reference to Milton as compared to Homer and Virgil, might be asserted of Durbin as associated with Bascom and Summerfield:

"The force of nature could not further go,
To make a third she joined the former two."

In studying Dr. Durbin's power in the pulpit we should first consider the general character of his sermons. He preached on great themes, such as "The Omnipotence of God," "The Character and Mission of Jesus Christ," "The Atonement," "The Conversion of St. Paul," "The Resurrection," "The Word of God Abiding in Us," "The Signs of the Times." Some of his discourses were highly expository. He loved the topical, and frequently made his sermon on a theme before selecting his text.

Analysis was the habit of his mind, yet the synthetical found large place in his preaching. He was fond of a psychological treatment of subjects. He looked at principles that, though unconsciously to ourselves, influence conduct—principles that are as real, though not recognized, as the intuitions. By close observation, by natural tendency, and by rational processes he detected and exposed the springs of moral action. His sermon in *Pulpit Eloquence of the Nineteenth Century* shows this characteristic of his preaching. It requires a high order of intellect to produce its proper power. But here Dr. Durbin was a master. He reasoned like Paley, he searched like Butler, he probed like Wesley. As if to give variety to thought and awaken interesting inquiry, it was quite common for him to indulge some quaint or novel speculation, but never to disturb faith in the revelation of God.

His preparation for the pulpit was reduced to a system. Early in the week he meditated his next theme and read upon the subject. He then made a sketch that he took into the pulpit and held up or turned over at will. Having prepared this outline he laid it aside, and brought it before his mind on Sabbath morning in the freshness of his theme and thoughts. Though he did not write sermons for delivery, he was far from the reproach that Owen Feltham cast on ministers. He says: "I admire the labor of some men that before studies done ascend the pulpit and there do take more pains than they have done in the library. . . . And this makes some such fugitive divines that like cowards they run away from the text."

Amid his many labors while pastor in Philadelphia he formed a preachers' class in elocution. The writer was a member, and recalls with what earnestness he insisted on having the mind stored with the best passages of poetry and prose, so as to be able to throw them off at will. By them he could sustain a statement, strengthen an argument, or form a climax.

In the pulpit his aspect was uniformly grave and thoughtful. There was nothing in his personal appearance to indicate the compass of his knowledge or his ability as a speaker. He was of medium size, his head was not large, his forehead was low, narrow, and receding, his eye was small and hazel, but capable of great expression, his mouth was that of an orator. His dress was faultless. He scrupulously adhered to the purpose

of worship. As a rhetorician, he knew all styles and could command any. He adopted for the time that which best suited his purpose, but believed with Seneca that "fit words are better than fine ones."

It has been said a good orator should "pierce the ear, allure the eye, and invade the mind of the hearer." All these Dr. Durbin did; his subjects containing matter of importance both for discussion and declamation. The introductions to his discourses were simple and appropriate. His first utterances were measured, and seemed to be sluggish, but his sentences were fraught with meaning, and the paragraphs showed progress, and when he reached his theme the subject was opened. At the beginning his whole manner was quiet, and he was without gesture. He could be heard in all parts of the house. Though there was no display, there was something tranquilizing and assuring in his speech and manner. After a little while genius began to flash. A bright thought lightens up the subject. The hand is drawn from the bosom and the soul is tender; style is diversified, a beautiful figure is employed. He had "pierced the ear" and it was all attention. He was an excellent teacher. Now he allures the eyes. They see in him more than instructor. He *pleases*; his voice, manner, spirit, show he is becoming more exalted by his theme. The people rise with him. Such is the mental absorption that he does not see his best friend sitting right before the pulpit. But if one in the congregation looks listless, him he sees. He is intent upon effect. If he saw the congregation was under the influence of the word, he would not lose his hold. On a certain occasion he was making a platform speech in Columbus, O., and giving statistics as the report of missions demanded. His array of figures was not the eloquence which they wanted. Perceiving this, he turned to the chair, made a polite bow, and said, "When I entered this Conference two days ago I looked upon the faces of those before me, and saw only two of all that were here forty-and-four years ago when, a stripling, I joined the Conference. I felt lonely; I felt sad;" and drawing his coat closer round him he said, "I felt like some oak riven of its branches." By this time, said our informant, the house was in tears, and then he resumed his subject with the undivided attention of the people.

He excelled in narrative. It was his boast that his mother had taught him that part of preaching. Using her "large spinning-wheel," she would tell him stories which made him ask for more. If at any time he saw the need of a story in preaching he had one at command.

Illustration was also one of his favorite methods of impressing truth. He thought, with Thomas Fuller, that if reasons are the pillars that sustain the temple of Christianity, illustrations are the windows that let in the light. His illustrations were from all departments of knowledge. He used art, science, and history, and he especially made much use of his travels in the holy land. But his illustrations only helped; they did not take the place of the Gospel.

Dr. Durbin's sermon on Naaman shows the accuracy and vividness of his word-painting and the effect of the familiar. He showed this great captain of his day in honor next the king, yet a loathsome leper. Of all loathsome diseases the most loathsome. Of all living men the most dying. Going to the king of Israel for a cure and exciting his wrath, then to the prophet, and, insulted at his conduct and directions, going away in a rage—for even a leper may be proud! Finally, trying the means and dipping seven times. We saw him do it, and saw his flesh come again, "not as the flesh of an old man," but as the flesh of a little child.

When not serving as pastor he used but few subjects, but took those best adapted and most easily treated. It is said, Bossuet, when asked what was his best sermon, replied, "The one I know best." Dr. Durbin said he was like the old Roman, who never threw away his sword while it would cut. He "better" knew its point, its edge, its temper, its weight, and its sweep. It was better for execution.

His pronunciation of a sentence or his emphasis upon a word was sometimes an amazing power. An elocutionist gave an example in a speech of Senator Preston. It was in the presidential campaign of 1840. Crittenden had spoken. Webster had occupied about two hours, but the people were still attentive. Preston rose, and uttered but the name "Martin Van Bu^{re}n!" This he thrice did. The first time with the accent of incredulity. The people shouted. The second time with an accent of scorn. The people stormed. But when the third

time he exclaimed "Martin Van Buren!" with an accent of contempt, the vast assembly was wild. They clapped, they stamped, they threw their hats into the air, and were at a loss for any adequate demonstration. It was climax on a word. David Garrick, who would give so many pounds to pronounce "O!" like Whitefield, understood this power.

But in my analysis of Dr. Durbin's eloquence his voice and elocution demand particular notice. As words convey thought, so the voice may show the soul. Authority, emotion, *unction*, are there. A teacher of the art of speaking has given three voices, that he severally distinguishes as the English, Roman, and Attic. Of the propriety of such designation we say nothing, but for our purpose accept them.

The *English* is that employed in conversation and in good reading. It makes the colloquial preacher. This, like John Wesley or William Jay, we may suppose Summerfield, from his physical condition, was compelled to use exclusively. The *Roman voice* is full, round, commanding. In this voice Bascom spoke his entire sermon. The *Attic* is of greatest compass, and expresses the strongest excitement. Such we may assume was the voice of Patrick Henry, as certainly it was of Edward Everett. Daniel Webster was excellent in the English, was grand in the Roman, but when his passion carried him to the Attic his voice broke and the effect was unequal. Dr. Durbin began in the English, advanced to the Roman, and culminated in the Attic. He could be commanding in the utterance of grand thought, but when he was most dramatic it was in the Attic. If *unction* can be predicated of the human voice, Dr. Durbin had it in a remarkable degree. It not only as to compass and key obeyed every mandate, but carried emotion, and with it seemed to convey the soul. It could awaken terror or draw tears. It could kindle rapture, and rouse to the sublimest purposes and noblest deeds. This was seen in pleading the cause of missions, and in the preaching of the word. A United States Senator of Virginia, years after his chaplaincy, declared that he had never heard a voice that so affected him, and he could never forget its tones. It could shoot out like light to dispel doubt, or *explode* like a shell to accomplish its design, but, unlike the shell, it did its work without destroying its own integrity.

But Dr. Durbin was pre-eminently the sacred orator, and felt that the Gospel was the great commission. The object that he sought, the spirit he possessed, and the effort that he made showed that his eloquence was a virtue. No sermon that he published, however grand the theme, or excellent the plan, or appropriate the diction, or logical the reasoning, nothing that he ever wrote, or that others can ever write of him, will give his voice or exhibit his spirit. Eloquence cannot be printed. Like the soul, it is never found by dissecting.

In the use of choice literature, Dr. Durbin did as he advised others to do. The climax of his sermon at the dedication of Trinity, Philadelphia, in 1841, was in a quotation. The service was on a week-day. It is doubtful whether we ever had such a congregation as at this time. Men of all professions were there. Ministers of various Churches were present in great numbers. When the preacher had so far shown the sins of men and the word of grace—when the audience had hung on his words, though in profound silence—he gave vent to the strongest emotion and the most burning passion in the familiar and almost trite lines from Cowper:

"O for a lodge in some vast wilderness,
Some boundless contiguity of shade,
Where rumor of oppression and deceit,
Of unsuccessful or successful war,
Might never reach me more! My ear is pained,
My soul is sick with every day's report
Of wrong and outrage with which earth is filled."

It is impossible to tell the power of that passage as he uttered it. When he laid his emphasis on "My ear is pained" we felt disgusted at wickedness; when he pronounced "wrong and outrage," we knew not how to meet the enormity. With the first, it was as if a *shingle started*; when he uttered "outrage," as if the *roof rose*. It was as if a stone spoke out of the wall, and a beam out of the timber answered it; as if material things were shocked at such unexampled sin; as if the very temple became vocal with accusations, and filled with revolt, while virtuous nature sought sanctuary from sin in some far-off hiding-place. Dr. George B. Ide, the brilliant preacher of the First Baptist Church, was present, and afterward remarked, "Parts were inimitable." We had often

heard that language *quoted*, never before *rendered*. It was not the quotation; it was not the words, but the speaker in them. He had no need to go to authors for either elegance, elevation, or eloquence, but he did it to support the grand truths that he presented.

The passage that we have heard quoted from Bascom more than any other is from S. T. Coleridge. Speaking of Christianity, he asks, "But whence did this happy organization first come? Was it a tree transplanted from paradise, with all its branches in full fruitage? or was it reared in sunshine. . . . With blood was it planted; it was rocked with tempests; the goat, the ass, and the stag, gnawed at it; the wild boar has whetted his trunk in its bark. . . . The path of lightning may be traced among its higher branches. . . . The whirlwind has more than once forced its stately top to touch the ground; it has bent like a bow, and sprung back like a shaft."

It was a saying of the renowned Dr. Nott that "No man can be eloquent for more than five minutes." He argued this as a philosophical fact. The influences on speaker or hearer could not be sustained for a longer period. Like violent diseases, they cannot be both acute and protracted. However this statement may fail to apply to certain styles of oratory, it is true of Dr. Durbin's. He might have two or three moving passages, sometimes none very marked. No orator is always eloquent. "This power," to use his own language, "does not always come, and I don't go after it, nor fret for it; when it comes to me I give it to the people." But when under this mighty influence, he said, it seemed the earth was too small for him. The might of his eloquence would sometimes be in a page, a paragraph, a sentence, and even a *word*. For pungency, for pathos, or for power, a well-constructed sentence cannot be too brief. It is a mistake, however, to think because Dr. Durbin's eloquent passages were brief that that which went before was not an essential part. There was eloquence in his power to still the thoughts and keep minds in eager receptivity to the truth. It prepared the way and held the mind. The result was the work of a moment, but there had been *preparation*.

To exhibit Dr. Durbin's claim to the highest style of eloquence, we name a sermon delivered in the "Union," Philadelphia, on Sabbath morning during Conference in 1836.

The text was one of the grandest in the Bible; Heb. vi, 17-19: "Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath: that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us: which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, . . . cast within the veil." Difficult as it now is to write of that sermon, it was then more difficult to speak of it. The people heard with attention, delight, and transport. He showed that the Christian has real, strong, everlasting consolation in Christ; that we are in the world as the ship is in the sea; that we as really need an anchor for the soul, and that we as truly have it. Storms arise, dangers threaten. Satan allows no "sea of glass" in the present state. Our anchor is hope; its ground the promise and the oath of God. It is "cast within the veil" of the upper temple, and as the anchor holds the ship, so this holds the soul. Then the preacher seemed to seize the anchor of our hope, as if it were of iron, and flesh was equal to spirit. The apparent accuracy of the aim, the force manifested in the heaving, and the direction taken, gave a kind of reality to the whole movement, to which all assented. Like a mighty Samson, with gesture and posture answering to his purpose, he gave one tremendous heave and shouted, "Brethren, it is within the veil." Then he further declared, "The ground is good, and there is no dragging of the anchor." He began to draw on the cable; the people joined him. It was as if every one in the congregation would lay hold. The preacher was more than himself. His eyes, like orbs of light, rolled and flashed, as if kindled by celestial fires. His countenance radiated. Every feature spoke. Every fiber of his frame seemed charged with electrifying power. It was as one of the days of his triumph.

Had Vinet been there he might have quoted this as one of the most perfect demonstrations of the power of "*dramatismia*" in the pulpit. All that enters into the sublime was present in that discourse. There was "grandeur of strength," "pathos that melted the heart and raised the passions." None will deny that there was skillful application of figure, or that there was a "noble manner of expression, and the structure of periods in dignity and grandeur."

Durbin and Bascom were simultaneously achieving the wonderful displays of eloquence by which each in his own way became famous; and yet even as orators the two were widely unlike. In some things few men could compare with Bascom; in some others Durbin stood alone. In form, in feature, in bearing, Bascom was a prince; Durbin had no external attraction, except in refined taste and manly bearing. Bascom's style was gorgeous; Durbin's luminous. Only the personality of Bascom saved his oratory from the charge of bombast; Durbin's language is its own vindication. Bascom labored as if the body was the engine to give power to the soul; Durbin as if the soul only used the body to show itself in its heat and intensity. The first paragraph of Bascom's discourse was a burst of eloquence; Durbin closed with an electrifying shock. Bascom began as if a few minutes were to do the work; Durbin as if preparing a foundation for a pyramid. Under Bascom infidels hid for very shame; under Durbin they threw down their weapons and sued for pardon. From first to last Bascom was vehement; Durbin restrained his vehemence for cumulative force. Bascom was Niagara with the rapids behind it; Durbin was the Hudson, with mountains and vale, with highlands and palisades crowned with villas, and pediments gleaming like diamonds upon crests of beauty. The effect of the preaching of these two men was dissimilar. On listening to Bascom almost any minister would feel as did the musician, when listening to a great master, who said, "I will bury my instrument;" on hearing Durbin he would say, "I will dig it up, for now I have learned to play better." They were both men of rare qualities and endowments. They are still great in their posthumous reputations. For either to have attempted the other would have been to do violence to nature and mar the economy of God.

Dr. Durbin's case formed an exception to the rule, as some say it exists, that great sermonizers usually fail in public extempore prayer. His were remarkable for their earnestness, solemnity, and fitness. While President of Dickinson College, in a season of revival he was at times so drawn out in prayer that he seemed to be alike unmindful of time or the expenditure of strength, so that he afterward felt the reaction for days. So, too, his prayers in public worship were only less effective than his most eloquent discourses.

The relations of life and the Christian character of Dr. Durbin strongly re-enforced his ministerial influence. In personal intercourse he had a quiet dignity, and, though never austere, rarely relaxed. In receiving and extending hospitality he was without display. In every place he was recognized in his superior talents and position, but in no instance did he display any show of vanity. Who ever knew him to be arrogant with the weak or supple with the strong? If at any time he was subjected as a writer, or in any way, to criticism, he let it pass, and it was his rule to allow no concern for the results of duty.

He was twice married, in both instances to a daughter of Alexander Cook, Esq., of Philadelphia. By his former wife he had three sons and two daughters. Only one of his sons survives him. One of his daughters married William Whitacar, Esq., of Philadelphia, the other Fletcher Harper, Esq., of New York. Within the present year the tears of the Church and humanity have fallen upon her grave. All the wealth of Dr. Durbin came through his marriage. It is doubtful if his salary ever more than supported him. In ecclesiastical matters he was called a "prudent progressive." Many years before lay delegation was introduced into the Church he was its advocate. Seven times successively he was elected a delegate to the General Conference, and his Conference never ceased thus to honor him till the infirmities of age forbade. When he resigned his place as Corresponding Secretary of the Missionary Society, in appreciation of his services and to retain his counsels the General Conference that accepted his resignation elected him Honorary Secretary of the Missionary Society. Then he whose life had been so full of labor, and whose labor had been so full of grand results, withdrew from the active services that had so long been his delight. Needful as rest had seemed to him, it was soon found that out of his accustomed work the powers of his mind and body more rapidly failed. He rarely appeared on the platform or in the pulpit, and after a serene and happy old age he was stricken with paralysis, and on October 18, 1876, at his residence in New York city, surrounded by his children and grandchildren, he saw the last of earth and first of heaven. A short time before his death, Bishop Janes, the Missionary Secretaries, and the Book Agents called on him to present a resolution passed by the bishops at

their last meeting. On hearing it read he replied, "he could recollect but one paper of the sort in all his life that was not distasteful to him," adding, "this paper was so evidently sincere, and was expressed in such terms, that he received it with gladness, and would cherish it among his pleasant memories." He alluded to his Christian experience. At first, he said, "the fact that he had not the joys which other Christians had gave rise to questioning doubts. But he afterward had learned better, and, though he had never been demonstrative, his experience as a Christian had been and still was satisfactory to his heart."

More than thirty years ago Dr. Abel Stevens, the historian of Methodism, pronounced Dr. Durbin "the most interesting preacher in the Methodist pulpit." Learned men we may have had of a more accurate if not a broader scholarship, writers of more fruitful, if not more facile, pens; but scarcely one whose mind was better disciplined, whose faculties were better directed, whose resources were more fully at the Church's command, or by whom more was accomplished in the diverse and responsible positions that he filled. When was learning, genius, culture, devotion to duty, turned to better account, or when did good common sense, his richest inheritance, show itself to greater advantage?

American Methodism has always had its men adapted to her stations; but who, from her origin, has filled so many distinguished charges and for so long a time? Is there one of all those various positions that he did not exalt by his talents and his skill and his moral worth? If as a Church we can boast a greater name than John Price Durbin, then indeed we are honored. In the senate, cabinet, diplomatic corps, judiciary, or chair of the executive he might have worthily filled the first place in the nation.

To the glory of Christ's kingdom he laid his talents at the foot of the cross and gave his life to the duties of the ministry of reconciliation. To the young Methodist preacher the life of J. P. Durbin is a vast folio for study, but on its title-page is the motto that formed the theme of one of his first baccalaureate discourses at Dickinson College: "The High Purpose and Firm Resolve." This is the key to his greatness, and grace furnishes that key.

ART. II.—THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT OF OLIVES.

OUR Lord's eschatological discourse to a few disciples "as he sat on the Mount of Olives, over against the temple" (Mark xiii, 3), is professedly a prophecy of things that were about to be accomplished. It has been understood and explained in most opposite ways, and yet there is, perhaps, no other sermon of Jesus on record the occasion and scope of which are so clearly exhibited in the immediate context. Perhaps, also, there is no other Scripture in the exposition of which dogmatic assumptions have exerted greater influence.

It will facilitate our study of this prophecy to present in tabular form all the statements of our Lord, in substance, as they appear in the three synoptic gospels. On comparing these three records we observe that Matthew gives the discourse in fullest form, and in a style conspicuously Hebraic. Our Lord probably uttered this sermon in the Aramaic language, and therefore no one of these evangelists has preserved the very words (*ipsissima verba*) he employed. Each one gives his own independent version, and they all agree in substance.

MATTHEW XXIV AND XXV.

I.

Four things before the End,
xxiv, 4-14.

1. False Christs and a great apostasy, 4, 5.
2. Wars, commotion of nations, famines, and earthquakes, 6-8.

3. Persecution, death, offenses, betrayals, hatred, false prophets, and great wickedness, 9-13.

4. The Gospel in all the world—*ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ*, 14.

II.

Three signs when the End (Consummation) is close at hand, 15-28.

1. The abomination of desolation, 15-18.
2. The great tribulation, 19-22.
3. False Christs and prophets doing signs and wonders, 23-28.

MARK XIII.

I.

Four things before the End,
xiii, 5-13.

1. False Christs and a great apostasy, 5, 6.
2. Wars, famines, and earthquakes, 7, 8.

3. Persecution. . . afflictions, betrayals, hatred, and putting to death, 9, 11-13.

4. The Gospel to all the nations—*εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, 10.

II.

Three signs when the End is close at hand, 14-23.

1. The abomination of desolation, 14-17.
2. The great tribulation, 18-20.
3. False Christs and prophets doing signs and wonders, 21-23.

LUKE XXI.

I.

Three things before the End,
xxi, 8-19.

1. False Christs, 8.
2. Wars, tumults, earthquakes, famines, pestilence, terrors, and signs from heaven, 9-11.

3. Persecution, betrayals, putting to death, and hatred, 12-19.

II.

Two signs when the End is close at hand, 20-24.

1. Jerusalem compassed with armies, 20, 21.
2. The great tribulation, 22-24.

III.

Apocalyptic picture of the End and the Parousia, 29-31.

1. Sun and moon darkened, stars fall, and powers of heaven shaken, 29.

2. Sign of Son of man in heaven, and coming in clouds with power and glory, 30.

3. Angel ministries, trumpet, gathering the elect, 31.

IV.

Counsels and Warnings, 32-51.

1. Similitude of the fig-tree, 32, 33.

2. All to occur in this generation, 34, 35.

3. Day and hour unknown, 36.

4. Like the flood, 37-39.

5. Sudden separations, 40, 41.

6. Admonition to watch, 42-51.

V.

Parable of the ten Virgins, xxv, 1-13.

VI.

Parable of the Talents, 14-30.

VII.

Prophecy of the Messianic Judgment, 31-46.

III.

Apocalyptic picture of the End and the Parousia, 24-27.

1. Sun and moon darkened, stars fall, and powers of heaven shaken, 24, 25.

2. Son of man in clouds with power and glory, 26.

3. Angel ministries, gathering of the elect, 27.

IV.

Counsels and Warnings, 28-37.

1. Similitude of the fig-tree, 28, 29.

2. All to occur in this generation, 30, 31.

3. Day and hour unknown, 32.

4. Admonition to watch, 33-37.

III.

Apocalyptic picture of the End and the Parousia, 25-28.

1. Signs in the sun, moon, and stars, distress and terror on earth, powers of heaven shaken, 25, 26.

2. Son of man in clouds with power and glory, 27.

3. Redemption at hand, 28.

IV.

Counsels and Warnings, 29-36.

1. Similitude of the fig-tree, 29-31.

2. All to occur in this generation, 32, 33.

3. Admonition to watch, 34-36.

Compare parable of the Pounds, Luke xix, 11-27.

OCCASION AND SCOPE OF THE SERMON.

On what particular occasion and for what purpose did our Lord utter this discourse? According to Matthew, it was spoken in connection with his terrible denunciation of Jerusalem. (Matt. xxiii, 34-39.) The disciples, awe-struck by the Master's words, called his attention to the magnificent buildings and great stones; but this act of theirs only drew from him additional words of fearful import: "Verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." (Matt. xxiv, 2.) Mark has no record of the words of denunciation, and Luke places them in another connection (Luke xi, 49-51; xiii, 34, 35), but all three synoptists

agree in declaring that this great prophecy was called forth at the request of the disciples as a fuller explanation of his words touching the overthrow of the temple. (Luke xxi, 6; Matt. xxiv, 2; Mark xiii, 2.) He went forth and seated himself on a part of the Mount of Olives directly opposite the temple, when, according to Mark (xiii, 3, 4), four disciples, Peter, James, John, and Andrew, asked him, privately (*κατ' ἰδίαν*): "Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when these things are all about to be accomplished?" Luke records this inquiry in nearly the same words, but in Matthew we find the question stated in the following form: "Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy presence (*τῆς σῆς παρουσίας*) and of the consummation of the age" [dispensation] (*συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος*)? The whole prophecy purports to be an answer to that question. He mentions a number of things which must first take place, and also some things by which they may know when the end [catastrophe] is close upon them, but the day and hour of its consummation, he assures them, are known only to the Father. Nevertheless, he affirms, that day and hour will fall within the period of a [the then living] generation. No assertion throughout the entire discourse is more positive and emphatic than this: "Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, till all these things be accomplished." (Matt. xxiv, 34; Mark xiii, 30; Luke xxi, 32.) The scope of the prophecy would seem, therefore, to be clear beyond controversy. It had explicit reference to the overthrow of the temple and the fall of Jerusalem, and was designed to answer the disciples' question, and inform them of the certainty and the nearness of that great catastrophe.

Many interpreters, however, have maintained that our Lord here prophesies of two different events, widely apart from each other in time. All admit that a great part of what he said had primary, if not sole, reference to the fall of Jerusalem; but there are a number of passages which are believed by some to refer to another and yet future consummation. A basis for this double import of the prophecy is supposed to be found in the form of the question which the disciples asked. As recorded by Mark and Luke, the question is twofold, touching, first, the *time* (*πότε, when*), and secondly, the *sign* (*τὸ σημεῖον*) of accomplishment or consummation. As we have observed above, the

form of the question as given by Matthew differs somewhat, and has been thought to contain a threefold implication, touching respectively the *time* of these things, the *sign* of the *parousia*, and the *end* of the age. But Matthew's language really involves only two points of inquiry, for "the sign of the *parousia*" is also the sign "of the consummation of the age."

How far may this double form of the question indicate or determine the scope of our Lord's answer? Did he regard the question as involving two distinct subjects, and in his answer distinguish between them so as to teach those disciples, and us who read these records, that the consummation of the age was to be something entirely different and far distant from the time of Jerusalem's overthrow? Is there any thing in this prophetic sermon, whether as recorded by Matthew, Mark, or Luke, which warrants the opinion that Jesus spoke of two distinct events, separated from each other by untold ages?

We must make our appeal to the records. In the tabular outline given above we have aimed to incorporate every important statement. The admonitions of Matt. xxv stand by themselves, but the rest of the discourse has in each of the gospels four parts: 1. Events to come before the end. 2. Signs of the nearness of the end. 3. The coming of the Son of man. 4. Admonitions for the disciples. All that is stated under these several heads has pertinency and force when understood as referring to a great event to come within the life-time of that generation; but we look in vain for any word or statement which appears designed to convey the idea that the *parousia* and the ruin of the temple would be events widely separated in time. It is most positively affirmed that the desolation of Jerusalem would be accompanied by unparalleled tribulations, that the sign of the *parousia* of the Son of man would appear immediately afterward, and that all these things would be accomplished before that generation passed away. If Jesus intended to distinguish and contrast two events, he was singularly unfortunate in his use of language. Can the faithful exegete allow that in answering his awe-stricken disciples he "paltered with them in a double sense?"

As illustrating how some able expositors find distinctions and contrasts where others can see none, we adduce the follow-

ing from Whedon's Commentary on Matthew (page 278). Holding that Matt. xxiv, 4-42, consists of series of paragraphs "in which the downfall of the city and state is described, and distinguished from the second coming," he says that verses 4-6 contain "a caution not to confound the *destruction* of the city with the *end* of the world." Not to speak at present of the misleading phrase, "end of the world," we appeal to the language of those two verses. "Take heed," said Jesus, "that no man lead you astray." Lead them astray about what? About confounding Jerusalem's ruin with the end of the world? Nothing in the context suggests such a thought. On the contrary, the next verse shows that he had in mind the danger of their being led astray by false pretenders claiming to be the Christ; but not the remotest allusion to a danger of their mistaking the destruction of the city for something else. So again, in verse 6, they are told that wars and rumors of wars will come; yea, they must needs come; "but the end is not yet." Here is no distinguishing the end from the fall of the city. On the contrary, these things, and much besides, as the verses immediately following show, will come to pass before the destruction of Jerusalem.

Again, says Dr. Whedon, in verses 7-14 we have "the commotions and *persecutions* preceding the destruction of the city described, and then contrasted with the *evangelization* of the world before the end." We submit, however, to the judgment of the unbiased reader, that the preaching of the Gospel of the kingdom, mentioned in verse 14, so far from being put in contrast with the persecutions and other troubles that must precede the end, is most clearly placed among them. It was, like the hatred, and betrayals, and defections, among the things which must take place before the end; but this is something very different from contrasting "the end" with the fall of the city and temple.

Verses 23-27 do, indeed, present a contrast between the false Christs and the Son of man. The manner of their coming is very different. But in these verses we can discover no trace of the proposition that the coming of the Son of man is to be centuries and millenniums distant from the appearance of the pseudo-Christs. So again, when verse 34 states that all these things shall be accomplished in that generation, and

verse 36 that no one but the Father knows the day and hour, there is no contrasting of events far separated from each other. To maintain that the day and hour might be ages after the life-time of that generation involves absurdities which will be noticed further on.

We submit, therefore, that the occasion and scope of our Lord's apocalyptic prophecy do not warrant an expectation of finding in it either a double sense or a description of two distinct events remote from each other in time. On the contrary, it purports to be throughout an answer to the question of the disciples, foretells a number of events that would take place before the overthrow of the city, and others that would mark the end of the age. As to the WHEN of their inquiry, it assures them that ALL THESE THINGS would occur in their generation, although the particular day and hour were known to none but the Father. Moreover, the numerous counsels and admonitions addressed privately and yet so solemnly to the disciples, to watch and be ready for the great event, are emptied of all naturalness and propriety by the supposition that the things spoken of would occur centuries after their time.

IMPORT OF THE LANGUAGE EMPLOYED.

If the occasion and scope of a prophecy are to control the interpreter, it would seem that the foregoing considerations must determine the main questions in our exposition of this important Scripture. But to many readers the specific time-limit of the prophecy seems inconsistent with the import of a number of the terms employed. This is affirmed especially of the language in Matt. xxiv, 29-31, the treading down of Jerusalem by the Gentiles (Luke xxi, 24), the preaching of the Gospel in the whole world (Matt. xxiv, 14, Mark xiii, 10), the end of the age, the *parousia*, and the picture of judgment in Matt. xxv, 31-46. We must examine these passages in detail.

The language of Matt. xxiv, 29-31, is cast in the form of Hebrew parallelism, and is accurately translated as follows :

But immediately after the tribulation of those days
The sun shall be darkened,
And the moon shall not give forth her light,
And the stars shall fall from the heaven,
And the powers of the heavens shall be shaken ;

And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven ;
And then shall all the tribes of the land mourn,
And they shall see the Son of man coming on the clouds of
heaven with power and great glory.
And he shall send forth his angels with a great sound of a
trumpet,
And they shall gather together his elect from the four winds,
From one extremity of heaven unto the other.

The parallels of this in Mark xiii, 24-27, and Luke xxi, 25-28, are not materially different, and the first question here to answer is, Was this style of language familiar with our Lord ? Another and a fundamental question is, whether such language must be literally understood. It would display a great want of critical judgment for one to presume to answer these questions by dogmatic assertions. Appeal must be taken to the language and style of analogous prophecies. What have we in other prophecies to help determine the import of such forms of speech ?

In Isaiah xiii, we have an oracle on the impending destruction of Babylon, which in verses 9-13 reads as follows :

Behold, the day of Jehovah comes,
Cruel—and wrath, and burning of anger,
To make the land a desolation ;
And he will destroy her sinners out of her.
For the stars of the heavens and their constellations shall
not shed forth their light ;
Dark is the sun in his going forth,
And the moon will not cause her light to shine ;
And I will visit evil upon the world,
And upon the wicked their iniquity.
And I will cause the arrogance of the proud to cease,
And the haughtiness of the lawless I will bring low ;
I will make men rarer than refined gold,
And mankind than the gold of Ophir.
Therefore will I make the heavens tremble,
And the earth shall shake out of her place,
In the overflowing wrath of Jehovah of hosts,
And in the day of the burning of his anger.

Both the heading of the chapter and the specific statements of verses 17 and 19 show that this passage is a prophetic picture of the overthrow of Babylon by the Medes. This is admitted by all the best interpreters. The ruin, according to the prophet, is to be wrought by Jehovah, who musters his

host of mighty heroes from the end of the heavens (verses 4, 5), causes a tumultuous noise of "kingdoms of nations," fills human hearts with trembling, shakes heaven and earth, and blots out sun, and moon, and stars. "Babylon, the beauty of the Chaldeans' pride, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah." (Verse 19.) The terrible destruction of the cities of the plain (comp. Gen. xix, 24-28) suggested some of the imagery of Isaiah's picture, but Babylon was not destroyed in like manner. It needed not literal fire and brimstone out of heaven to fulfill this prophecy. The overwhelming wrath and burning anger of Jehovah employed the Medes and Persians to accomplish on Babylon what had been accomplished by the elements of nature on Sodom and Gomorrah. The great prophetic thought in such descriptions is: The terrible judgment will be executed by Him who holds all the forces of earth and heaven in his hand. So, again, in Isa. xix, 1, the impending judgment of Egypt is portrayed in the same style of speech:

Behold, Jehovah riding upon a swift cloud,
And he will come into Egypt,
And the idols of Egypt shall tremble at his presence,
And the heart of Egypt shall melt in the midst of it.

Again, in chapter xxxiv, 4, 5, the same prophet foretells the desolation of Edom in the following strain:

All the hosts of the heavens shall be melted,
And the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll,
And all their host shall fall,
As falls a leaf from the vine,
And as a fallen fig from the fig-tree.
For my sword shall be sated in the heavens;
Behold, upon Edom it shall come down,
And upon the people of my curse, for judgment.

The prophet Micah (i, 3, 4) proclaims the approaching ruin of Samaria in these words:

Behold, Jehovah goeth forth out of his place,
And he will come down and tread upon the high places of
the land;
And the mountains shall melt under him,
And the valleys shall be cleft,
Like wax before the fire,
Like waters poured down a steep place.

Ezekiel takes up his lamentation over the destruction about to fall on Egypt, and, among many other images of fearful judgment, has the following, chapter xxxii, 7, 8 :

In quenching thee I will cover the heavens,
And I will darken the stars,
The sun with a cloud will I cover,
And the moon shall not give forth her light;
All the luminaries in the heavens will I darken over thee,
And I will put darkness upon thy land,
Saith the Lord Jehovah.

In Matthew xxiv, 15, Jesus speaks familiarly of "Daniel the prophet," and quotes one of his peculiar expressions. Among the written visions of this same prophet (chapter vii, 13, 14) occurs the following passage :

I gazed in the visions of the night,
And behold, with the clouds of heaven,
One like the Son of man was coming,
And to the Ancient of Days he approached,
And into his presence they brought him ;
And to him was given dominion, honor, and a kingdom;
And all the nations, peoples, and tongues shall serve him.
His dominion is an eternal dominion, which shall not pass away,
And his kingdom one that shall not be destroyed.

Just before this passage (verses 9, 10) the prophet thus describes the Ancient of Days, enthroned for the purpose of executing judgment :

His raiment was white as snow,
And the hair of his head like pure wool;
His throne, flames of fire;
His wheels, burning fire.
A stream of fire flowed forth and went out from before him;
Thousand thousands ministered unto him,
And myriad myriads before him were standing ;
The judgment was set, and the books were opened.

Such is the style of language constantly employed by the Old Testament prophets in announcing the judgments of God upon cities and nations. There is scarcely a word or phrase in Matt. xxiv, 29-31, and the parallels in Mark and Luke, which has not its exact equivalent in one or more of the passages above quoted. Jesus was speaking to a select company who, from childhood, had been made familiar with the prophets, hearing

them, like the books of Moses, "read in the synagogue every Sabbath." (Acts xiii, 27; xv, 21.) Whether they understood what they read we need not here inquire; but on what rational principles of consistent interpretation can it be claimed that the prophetic language, admitted by all exegetes to be symbolical and figurative in the Old Testament, must be understood literally when used by Jesus in depicting a similar catastrophe? Is it not proper to believe that those holy oracles, being inspired of God (2 Tim. iii, 16), were divinely chosen forms of prophetic teaching? If so, why should Jesus employ other forms, or why employ these in a different sense from that in which they were first intended? The Jewish historian declares that the multitude of those who perished amid the ruin of Jerusalem exceeded that of all similar calamities, whether wrought by human or divine agency, and he reckons the number of the slain at eleven hundred thousand, and the captives at ninety-seven thousand.* Jesus himself represents the tribulation as surpassing any thing of like character in history. (Matt. xxiv, 21.) Was it not fitting, then, that he should speak of it in the lofty tone of prophecy, and employ the same style of language as other prophets had used in foretelling the ruin of Babylon, and Edom, and Samaria, and Egypt?

It should be observed that the highly wrought poetic language of prophecy is frequently interwoven with details of fact. Every one of the Old Testament passages above cited is connected with statements which all readers and expositors have understood literally. So there is no ground for the notion of some writers, who tell us that if we interpret Matt. xxiv, 29-31, as poetic prophecy, we must interpret all the rest of the chapter as poetry. The superficial plea, that if sun and moon and heavens in verse 29 are not to be understood literally then we cannot take the words "Judea" and "mountains" in verse 16 in a literal sense, is unworthy of respectful notice. An intelligent reader's common sense, may be trusted to determine between plain prosaic statements and the tone and manner of such a passage as the one in question. It would be folly to attempt to construct a vocabulary of prophetic metaphors, and bring rigid definitions to the exposition of such highly wrought poetic Scriptures as those we have quoted from

* Josephus, *Wars of the Jews*, book vi; ix, 3, 4.

the prophets. No set of rules can be drawn up to govern every case, but, in distinguishing between poetry and prose, appeal must ever be had to the reader's critical and rational judgment. Two extremes are to be avoided in explaining the Hebrew prophets: one is the allegorical and spiritualizing process, by which each word and figure is made to yield a distinct and special significance; the other is a bald verbalism, which insists on the literal meaning of each expression of the prophet. Jesus unquestionably appropriated Old Testament prophetic language and style in Matt. xxiv, 29-31. Even the mourning of "all the tribes of the land" (verse 30, not *all the nations of the world*) is mentioned in language appropriated from Zechariah xii, 11, 12.

Leaving particular questions to be discussed further on, we next examine the words of Luke xxi, 24, which are supposed to contemplate events which could not have taken place in that generation. Referring to the great wrath about to be poured upon the Jewish people, Jesus says: "They shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all the nations, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down by nations until the times of the Gentiles [or nations] be fulfilled."

There are different explanations of the phrase "times of the Gentiles." Some regard it as equivalent to "the fullness of the Gentiles," spoken of in Rom. xi, 25, or, rather, to the times and opportunities of grace afforded the Gentiles under the Gospel. But this interpretation, as Van Oosterzee well observes, interpolates a thought entirely foreign to the context.* The times of the Gentiles are much more naturally understood as the period allotted to the Gentiles to fulfill the divine judgments of which the passage speaks. So the phrase is explained by Bengel, Meyer, and Van Oosterzee. The most natural and obvious parallel, however, is Rev. xi, 2, where the outer court of the temple is said to be given over to the Gentiles, by whom the holy city is to be trodden down forty-two months, a period equivalent [some think] to the "time and times and half a time" of Rev. xii, 14. In Rev. xii, 6, [perhaps] this same period is spoken of as twelve hundred and sixty days, which would be three years and a half, reckoning three hundred and sixty days to a year. This number is constantly associated with

* See his Commentary on Luke xvi, 24, in Lange's *Biblework*.

a period of woe and disaster to the city or people of God. The time, times, and half a time, or three and a half times, is a suggestive symbolical number, a divided seven (comp. Dan. ix, 27), significant of a broken covenant, an interrupted sacrifice, a triumph of some heathen enemy, a short but signal period of woe. These *kaipoi, times*, (comp. the Sept. and Theodotion on Dan. vii, 25, xii, 7), are accordingly best understood as times of judgment upon Jerusalem, rather than times of salvation for the Gentiles. But there is nothing in the words or the context to warrant the comment of Bengel, that the treading down of Jerusalem by Romans, Persians, Saracens, Franks, and Turks is to be understood. The legitimate import of the words is amply met by explaining the "times of the Gentiles" as the three and a half times, approximating three and a half years, during which the Gentile armies besieged and trampled down Jerusalem.

But if one accept the view that "times of the Gentiles" denote a long period, either of grace or of judgment, the *terminus a quo* must needs be the beginning of that siege in which a million Jews perished (alas! how many "by the edge of the sword"), and ninety-seven thousand were led into captivity. How does it in the least conflict with the time-limits of the prophecy to say that the desecration of the city would continue centuries after its fall? This is at most an incidental statement, and it would be a singular procedure of exegesis to make it, unless manifestly necessary, antagonize the occasion and scope of the whole discourse. Who would think of finding any such difficulty in Isa. xiii, 20-22, or of construing the specified perpetual desolation of Babylon as inconsistent with the thought that the terrible day of her judgment was close at hand? "It shall never be inhabited," says the prophet; "wild beasts of the desert shall lie there, wolves shall cry in their castles, and jackals in the palaces; and her time is near to come, and her days shall not be prolonged." Had the prophet explicitly declared that the overthrow would occur within forty days, it would not in the least degree have been inconsistent with his statement that it would not have been inhabited "from generation to generation." It was not within the scope of our Lord's discourse, in answering the disciples' question, to tell them of all that would follow the ruin of the city, and the incidental mention of a long tread-

ing down of Jerusalem should no more affect the interpretation of his sermon than if he had added, after Luke xxi, 27, "I will reign until I have put all enemies under my feet."

But, according to Matt. xxiv, 14, the Gospel of the kingdom is to be preached "in the whole world for a testimony unto all the nations," before the end, or consummation of the age. Compare, also, Mark xiii, 10. This has quite generally been understood of the propagation of the Gospel, and the evangelization of all nations by the agencies of the Christian Church; and it is often said that more than half of the human race now existing have not heard of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Therefore "the end" here spoken of must be in the far future.

Surely, if such a preaching of the Gospel of the kingdom as will effect the thorough Christianizing of the world is here intended, "the end" was very far off from Jesus and his disciples; and how, with knowledge of such a future as awaited the Gospel in all lands of the habitable globe, Jesus could have said, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, This generation shall not pass until all these things be accomplished," is to us utterly inexplicable. But here again we have need to interpret Scripture by Scripture. May not the words here employed be capable of another interpretation, in strict accord with the usage of New Testament writers, and at the same time in strict harmony with the time-limit of this prophecy? The following passages ought to settle this question with all candid inquirers. According to Luke ii, 1, all this same world (*οικουμένη*) was enrolled by a decree of Augustus Cæsar. In Acts xi, 28, mention is made of a great famine "over all the world" in the days of Claudius. In Acts xvii, 6, Paul and Silas are spoken of as those who had "turned the world upside down:" and in Acts xxiv, 5, Paul is accused as being "a pest, and a mover of insurrections among all the Jews throughout the world." From these passages it is clear that the word *οικουμένη*, *world*, was commonly applied to the inhabited regions of the Roman Empire, [or to Judea] and this is conceded by all competent authorities.

The language of the parallel text in Mark (xiii, 10) is: "Unto all the nations first the Gospel must be preached," and here again we have New Testament usage to show the import of such a statement. In Col. i, 5, 6, the apostle speaks of "the word of the truth . . . which is come unto you; even as it is also in all the

world (ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ) it is bearing fruit, and increasing, as *it doth* in you also," and in verse 23 of the same chapter he says this Gospel was "preached in all creation, ἐν πόσῃ κτίσει, under the heaven." Here are terms more comprehensive in their nature than those used by our Lord, and yet they are applied to the preaching of the Gospel as it had already been done in the apostolic times. In explaining such terms, one must keep in mind the stand-point and usage of the sacred writers, and remember that "all the nations," and "all the world," did not mean to Galilean fishermen, or to learned Jewish rabbis, what they do to a modern reader, familiar every hour with telegraphic communications from remotest continents and islands.

If one ask why the Gospel must needs have been preached throughout the Roman world before the end of the Mosaic *cultus*, it may be answered, Because it was necessary that the new doctrine should be immovably established among men before the old *cultus* was shaken down, and made to pass away. The meaning of our Lord in this discourse was not that the world would be entirely converted to the new faith previously to "the end" of which he spoke. It was for a testimony, or evidence (μαρτύριον), to all the nations that a new light had come into the world. The conversion of the world, and the subduing of all things in it to the reign of Christ, was another and greater work, to be accomplished after the overthrow of Jerusalem, and the end of the Mosaic dispensation.

Nevertheless, it is urged, there are other terms employed by our Lord in this prophecy which forbid the reference of it all to the fall of Jerusalem and the temple. Chief among these is the much-abused and widely misunderstood phrase, "the end of the age." The common translation, "end of the world," has been a delusion to many readers of the English Bible, and this could hardly have been otherwise. But it is very strange that so many learned writers, who have properly translated and explained συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος, *consummation of the age*, should have paid so little regard to the question, What *age* is intended? They generally assume without question that the Gospel or Messianic age is meant. But, according to the whole trend of Gospel teaching, that age had not come when Jesus uttered this prophecy. It was only "near," or "at hand." The *consummation* or *end* of the age is equivalent to the Hebrew

phrase אַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים, *end of the days*, commonly rendered in the Septuagint by αἱ ἔσχαται ἡμέραι, *the last days*. Now, the uniform teaching of the New Testament is, that Christ's whole ministry fell in the end of the days, or last days of an αἰών, or age. But surely it was not in the end of the Messianic age; that age still stretches on into the indefinite future. It was toward the close of the Mosaic, Jewish, or pre-Messianic *eon*, and near the beginning of the Christian *eon*, that God brought life and immortality to light by the Gospel revelation. Accordingly, in Heb. ix, 26, we read: "Now, once, at the end of the ages (ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων), hath he been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." So, too, in chapter i, 1, of the same epistle, "God . . . hath at the end of these days (ἐπ' ἔσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων) spoken unto us in his Son." Peter also speaks of Christ as "foreknown before the foundation of the world (κόσμον), but manifested at the end of the times (ἐπ' ἔσχάτου τῶν χρόνων) for your sake" (1 Pet. i, 20); and that Paul considered himself as living near the consummation of an *eon* appears from his words to the Corinthians: "These things happened unto them by way of example; and they were written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the ages (τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων) are come." (1 Cor. x, 11.) If, now, Christ and his apostles lived and labored near the close of an *eon*, or of *eons*, it is obviously an error to represent them as living in an *eon* which had not yet fully opened in their day, and which they spoke of as about to come.

Here, then, arises a most important question in this discussion; namely, What was the end of the age of which Jesus spoke? *The age itself was the pre-Messianic*, as the passages just cited show; for the New Testament writers never represent themselves as in the first days, or the beginning of the age, but in its last days. At what point, then, are we to understand the end (τὸ τέλος)? Some have said, at the crucifixion, when Jesus said, Τετέλεσται, *It is finished*: others designate the resurrection of Jesus; a few fix upon his ascension; but many teach that the day of Pentecost was the transition point where we must fix the end of the old dispensation and the beginning of the new. To all these theories alike there are two fatal objections: 1. That they are irreconcilable with the statement of Jesus that the Gospel must be first preached unto all the nations

before the end; and 2. That the apostles, long after the day of Pentecost, represent themselves as living in the last days, and near the end of the age. It is a begging of the whole question, and a dogmatic assumption, to say, as Stuart does, that the last days in the New Testament denote "the period of the Christian dispensation," and, "like other appellations brought into use in a similar way (comp. Luke vii, 20), it continued to be employed after the *last days*, that is, the Christian dispensation, had commenced; and it is employed to designate any part of the time which this dispensation comprises." * Such a misuse of the phrase has no warrant in the New Testament, and the reference to Luke vii, 20, has no relevancy, for to John the Baptist the Messiah and his kingdom were yet to come. By the teaching of Christ and the gift of the Holy Spirit the disciples truly tasted of "the powers of the age to come." (Heb. vi, 5), but they recognized themselves as in the last times of an *eon* that was to be succeeded by the kingdom and glory of their Lord. At what point, then, shall we understand *the end*? Was there any great crisis to mark such a consummation, or any notable sign by which the end of the pre-Messianic age might be known?

Is it not strange that any careful student of our Lord's words should fail to understand his answer to this very question? The disciples asked, *πότε*, WHEN shall it be? Jesus proceeded to foretell a variety of things which they would live to see; he also foretold the horrors of the siege of Jerusalem, which we know to have been most accurately fulfilled; no prophecy of the downfall of the Jewish temple and metropolis could have been more explicit; but, having told them of all these things, he added: "When ye see these things coming to pass, know ye that it [or he] is nigh—at the door. Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away until all these things be accomplished." The ruin of the temple and its *cultus* was the great sign which marked the end of the pre-Messianic age.

But even in the face of these most positive utterances of our Lord, many writers have gone about to nullify the obvious meaning of the phrase "this generation" (*ἡ γενεὰ αὐτῆς*). Even if these words were of doubtful import, such parallel texts as the following would seem amply sufficient to determine it:

* *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 266. Andover, 1860.

"The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then shall he render unto every man according to his deeds. Verily I say unto you, There be some of them that stand here who shall not taste of death until they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." (Matt. xvi, 27, 28; comp. Mark ix, 1; Luke ix, 27.) To suppose that two different comings are here intended is virtually to assume that our Lord was willing to confuse the minds of his disciples. What sensible teacher, desiring to make himself understood, would thus mix up statements of two events centuries apart. If Jesus meant thus sharply to distinguish between coming *in his glory* and coming *in his kingdom*, he might certainly have employed less ambiguous language. He is not careful to keep up such a distinction in Matt. xxv, 31, *ff.*, where he says that "when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the angels with him," he will say to the righteous, "Come, inherit the *kingdom* prepared for you from the foundation of the world." So, too, in Luke xix, 11, *ff.*, when he would instruct certain ones who "supposed that the *kingdom* of God was immediately to appear," he indulged in no such fine-spun subtleties as that his *kingdom* and his *glory* were two distinct ideas, to be kept widely apart. Then, if ever, it would have been pertinent to have made such a distinction. But, as in the parable of the talents (Matt. xxv, 14-31), he admonished his disciples that his kingdom might be so delayed that it was of the first importance for them to improve the intervening time. We are slow to believe that any careful student, not influenced by preconceived dogma, would seriously suppose that Jesus, in Matt. xvi, 27, 28, contrasts two different comings, centuries apart. Nor is it reasonable to suppose that the disciples were so well informed of such a distinction as to understand which particular coming he meant when he said, according to Matt. x, 23: "Verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have finished (τελέσητε, *completed*, gone the round of) the cities of Israel until the Son of man be come."

The significations which, under the pressure of a dogmatic exigency, have been put upon the phrase "this generation," in Matt. xxiv, 34, and its parallels, must appear in the highest degree absurd to an unbiased critic. It has been explained as meaning the human race (Jerome), the Jewish race (Clarke,

Dorner, Auberlen), and the race of Christian believers (Chrysostom, Lange). But what a senseless platitude for any one, and especially for Jesus, to say: "The human race (or the Jewish nation, or Christian people) will not pass away until all these things be accomplished!" Who could ever be thought to have entertained a different opinion? The evident meaning of the word is seen in such texts as Matt. i, 17, xvii, 17, Acts xiv, 16, xv, 21 (by-gone generations, generations of old), and nothing in New Testament exegesis is capable of more convincing proof than that *yeved* is the Greek equivalent of our word *generation*, that is, the mass or great body of people living at one period—the period of average life-time. Even in such passages as Matt. xi, 16, Luke xvi, 8, where the thought of a class of people is implied, the persons referred to are contemplated as contemporaries. Manifestly, the statement that "this generation shall not pass away until all these things be fulfilled," indicates substantially the same time-limit as the statement that "there are some standing here who shall not taste of death until they see the kingdom of God."

The word *PAROUSIA* is so constantly associated, in current dogmatics, with the ultimate goal of human history—the final crisis of the world, that ordinary readers lose sight of its simple meaning in the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament. The word means *presence* as opposed to *absence*. One of the best illustrations of its usage is seen in Philippians ii, 12: "So then, my beloved, even as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence (*ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ μου*) only, but now much more in my absence (*ἐν τῇ ἀπουσίᾳ μου*), work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." But as the personal presence of any one implies a previous coming, so this word is not improperly rendered *coming* in many passages, and the verb *ἐρχομαι*, to *come*, is often employed to denote the appearance and kingdom of Christ. (Comp. Matt. xvi, 27, 28; xxiv, 30; xxv, 31, etc.) But to assume that the coming or the presence of Christ must needs be fleshly, or visible to mortal eyes, is to involve his doctrine in great confusion. Whatever the form or nature of his *parousia*, as taught in this prophetic discourse, our Lord unmistakably associates it with the destruction of the temple and city, which he represents as the signal termination of the pre-Messianic age. His coming in the clouds, accompanied by

the angels, darkening the heavens, and shaking the elements, are, as we have seen above, forms of speech borrowed from the Old Testament prophets. They are part and parcel of the genius of prophetic discourse, and are to be explained in the same way that we explain such forms of expression in Joel or in Isaiah. Why should the coming of the Son of man on the clouds, to execute judgment on that wicked generation, be understood or explained differently from Jehovah's "riding upon a swift cloud," and coming to execute judgment upon Egypt? (Isa. xix, 1.) The language of Matt. xxiv, 30, concerning "the Son of man coming in the clouds," is taken from Daniel's night vision (Dan. vii, 13), in which he saw the Son of man coming in the clouds to the "Ancient of Days," and receiving from him a kingdom and dominion and glory. The kingdom thus received was no other than the one symbolized by the stone cut out of the mountain (Dan. ii, 34, 35), which became a great mountain and filled all the earth. It is the same kingdom which Jesus compared to a grain of mustard seed, and to leaven. (Matt. xiii, 31-33.) It "comes not with observation" (Luke xvii, 20), so that men can point to it as a scenic display, and say, "Lo, it is yonder," or "Lo, it is here." Why insist, then, that the coming of the Son of man in the clouds must mean more on the lips of Jesus than in the writings of Daniel? It denotes in both places a sublime and glorious reality, the greatest event in human history, but not a natural phenomenon of such a character as to be a matter of display to the eyes of men. The Son of man came in heavenly power and glory to supplant Judaism by a better covenant, and to make the kingdoms of the world his own, and that *parousia* dates from the fall of the Jewish temple and metropolis.

We cannot see how human language is capable of making any thing more definite than Matt. xxiv, 29, does that the sign of the Son of man's coming in heaven would follow *immediately after* the unparalleled sufferings of the siege of Jerusalem. Jesus affirmed that the tribulation (*θλίψις*) of that time would surpass any thing of its kind ever known before or to occur thereafter (verse 21), and Josephus (*Wars*, Preface, 4) declares that, in his judgment, the misfortunes of all men from the beginning of time were scarcely equal to those of the Jews during this fearful war. The effort of some writers to get rid

of the obvious meaning and force of the word *εὐθέως*, *immediately*, is truly pitiable. Some have borrowed Luke xxi, 24 as a context, and assumed that the tribulation of Matt. xxiv, 29, is to be understood of a tribulation subsequent to the untold ages or times during which Jerusalem is to be trodden down of the Gentiles.* Facts or statements recorded in one gospel may, indeed, help us to understand difficult passages in another, and what is obscure in one writer is often made clear by the manner in which another presents it. But to appropriate a *context* from another book, especially for the purpose of changing the obvious import of an emphatic word, is not permissible. No reader of Matt. xxiv, unless beset by a preconceived opinion, would ever imagine that the "tribulation" of verse 29 was other than that of the whole preceding context, (verses 15-28;) and to interpolate a passage at a point where it would change the essential meaning, and make Matthew's record inconsistent with itself, is to treat that evangelist's intelligence with singular disrespect. Others have taken the word *εὐθέως* to mean *suddenly*. But how does this help the case? If the "tribulation of those days" refers to the tribulation of which the preceding context has been speaking, what boots it to say *suddenly*, rather than *immediately* after, the sun shall be darkened? To foist in the idea of another tribulation, which should come thousands of years later than the one of which the writer has been speaking, is a procedure too violent to be allowed by any careful exegete. Moreover, Mark's language expressly declares that the apocalyptic signs shall be "in those very days after that tribulation" (Mark xiii, 24), and all the gospels agree in affirming as the solemn words of Christ himself that all these things were to be accomplished before that generation passed away.

Those writers who find two different events in this prophecy lay great stress on the words, "of that day and hour no one knows, neither the angels of the heavens, nor the Son, but the Father only." (Matt. xxiv, 36; Mark xiii, 32.) This statement, however, in no way contravenes the time-limit named in the immediate context. The two statements must be taken together, and are simply these: 1) that all these things of which he had been speaking would be accomplished before

* See Whedon's Commentary on Matthew, p. 277.

that generation passed away, and 2) that the particular day and hour were unknown to any but the Father. To assume that *the day* and *hour* belong to a period ages later than the time of that generation is very much like accusing our Lord of solemn trifling. How does it essentially differ from saying: "All these things shall assuredly come to pass in the life-time of this generation, but the day and the hour may be thousands of years in the future! Watch ye, therefore, for ye know not what day your Lord is coming!!" No evangelical believer should be willing to attribute such prophesying to the Lord Jesus Christ. What he did say, and all that his words legitimately imply, may be stated thus: "I most solemnly assure you that all these things will occur before this generation shall have passed away, and I give you signs by which ye may know when the end is close upon you, but of the particular day and hour, it is not given me to make known. Therefore, it behooves you to watch and be ready at every hour."

The admonition to watch is emphasized in Matt. xxv by the three parables of the virgins, the talents, and the judgment. These additions are peculiar to Matthew's gospel, but they are all associated with the coming of the Son of man. In the last of the three the Great Teacher transcends the form of parable, and assumes the lofty style of didactic prophecy. This picture of divine judgment forms a magnificent and appropriate conclusion to the sermon on the Mount of Olives. The faithful student of Old Testament prophecy will not fail to recognize its analogy with Joel's picture of the assembling of all nations in the valley of Jehoshaphat. "There," said Jehovah, "will I sit to judge all the nations round about." (Joel iii, 11, 12; comp. Zech. xiv, 1-7.) How natural that our Lord, sitting on the mountain above the valley thus designated by the prophet, should have appropriated both the language and imagery of Joel. The connection of such a sublime portrayal of judgment with the overthrow of Jerusalem, and the opening of the new Messianic *eon*, was eminently appropriate. For by the principles of judgment here set forth the Son of man, to whom all judgment has been given, must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet. Matthew-xxv, 31-46, is a most impressive picture of the administration of the Lord Jesus Christ, from the hour of the signal overthrow

of Judaism until he shall have delivered up the kingdom to the Father. (1 Cor. xv, 24.) We miss the true scriptural doctrine of judgment (שפטים, *klais*) when we conceive it as confined to one last day, and consisting of a formal rehearsal of every act of human history before a tribunal at which the individuals of all nations and times are to be simultaneously assembled. The mediatorial reign of Christ may, indeed, appropriately end in some such sublime review, and this has been the common belief of the Church ; but God is judge of the living as well as of the dead, and it is a grave fallacy of interpretation to represent "the day of the Lord," or "the day of judgment," as something deferred to the close of human history. The Old Testament doctrine is, that "the kingdom is Jehovah's, and he is ruler among the nations." (Psa. xxii, 28.) "Say among the nations, Jehovah reigneth ; he shall judge the peoples with equity. He cometh, he cometh to judge the earth ; he shall judge the world in righteousness, and the peoples in his truth." (Psa. xevi, 10-13.) The Old Testament is full of such teaching, and the day of judgment for any wicked nation, city, or individual is the day on which the penal visitation falls. The judgment of God's saints is manifest in every signal event which magnifies goodness and condemns iniquity. This divine administration of the world, which in the Hebrew Scriptures is the work of Jehovah, is represented as now committed unto Christ. The Father has given him "authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of man." (John v, 27.) This great truth was specially foretold in the prophecies of Messiah's work. (Isa. xi, 3-5 ; Dan. vii, 13, 14 ; Mic. iv, 3, 4.) The Son of man came in signal judgment upon the apostate nation when Jerusalem fell. That was the first conspicuous exhibition of his judicial work, and marked the crisis and end of the pre-Messianic age. The judgment scene of Matt. xxv, 31-46 should, therefore, be understood not of a single scene to be witnessed ages hence, but of a divine procedure which had its formal beginning at that crisis of dispensations, and is going on with the progress of the Messianic age. Christ is now King and Judge, but all things are not yet subjected to him, and he must reign until he shall have put all things in subjection under his feet. (1 Cor. xv, 25-27.)

We need not assume to say how far and in what manner Christ executes his judgments or gathers his elect by the ministry of angels. He who "makes the clouds his chariot, who walks upon the wings of the wind, making his angels winds, and his ministers a flame of fire" (Psa. civ, 3, 4, comp. Heb. i, 7), is imminently present in all the great crises of this world's history, and he makes his angels ministering spirits to serve such as are to inherit salvation. (Heb. i, 14.) Our Lord represented Lazarus as carried away (*ἀπενεχθῆναι*) by the angels into Abraham's bosom. (Luke xvi, 22.) But there is no warrant in Scripture for the notion that when the angels are sent forth on missions of mercy or of judgment their operations must needs be visible to mortal eyes. When the impious Herod Agrippa allowed himself to be honored as a god, "immediately an angel of God smote him, and, becoming eaten of worms, he breathed out his spirit." (Acts xii, 22, 23.) Human eyes saw nothing but the curse of a foul disease, or a terrible plague; but Scripture sees back of it the potent ministry of a destroying angel. (Comp. Exod. xii, 23; 2 Sam. xxiv, 16.) So the visible *effects* of divine judgment were terribly manifest in the unparalleled miseries of Jerusalem. The righteous blood of unnumbered martyrs was visited upon that generation (Matt. xxiii, 35, 36); and where the Jewish historian saw and made record of appalling tribulation and woe, the word of prophecy discerned a "revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven, with the angels of his power [personal or natural] in flaming fire, rendering vengeance to them that know not God, and to them that obey not the Gospel." (2 Thess. i, 7, 8.)

The language of our Lord in Matt. xxiv, 40, 41, implies that his *parousia* would not involve the cessation of the human race on earth. THEN, said he (*τότε*, that is, at the time of the *παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* mentioned in the verse immediately preceding), "there shall be two men in the field; one is taken and one is left; two women shall be grinding at the mill; one is taken and one is left." That this cannot naturally be understood of being *taken captive* (as A. Clarke, Wetstein, and others) is generally maintained by the best critics. It seems much more appropriately explained of the gathering of the elect mentioned in verse 31, and as referring to the same rapture of living saints as that of which Paul speaks in 1 Thess. iv,

16, 17; 1 Cor. xv, 51, 52. But this, as the apostle admonishes, is "a mystery." * (1 Cor. xv, 51.) The most obvious thought suggested is that of a translation to heaven without seeing death. That any such sudden translations occurred in that generation, or that any number of the saints who had fallen asleep were then raised up, we have no record or evidence outside of these prophecies themselves. But it is pertinent to ask whether this class of events, any more than the ministry of angels, was of a nature to be witnessed by mortals in the flesh? It was a special favor to Elisha that he was permitted to behold Elijah when the latter was taken up. (2 Kings ii, 9-12.) A similar favor enabled Elisha's servant to see the mountain full of horses and chariots of fire. (2 Kings vi, 17.) So there appears no sufficient reason to assume, as a matter of course, that if such supernatural events had occurred in connection with the fall of Jerusalem, they would necessarily have been witnessed and recorded by men. The nearest approach we have to a record of any such event is the statement of Matt. xxvii, 52, 53, that, at the time of Jesus's death and resurrection, "many bodies of the saints who had fallen asleep were raised, and, coming forth out of the tombs, they entered into the holy city, and appeared unto many." That was a most wonderful fact, but it was not a phenomenon recognized by the world of the living. Human history has made no note of it. No other one of the New Testament writers has made any allusion to it. But there is no shadow of evidence that the statement is an interpolation or a falsehood. Nothing but a dogmatic bias or prepossession stands in the way of accepting it according to its most obvious import. If it be true that such a remarkable resurrection of many saints occurred at the time of Jesus's resurrection, but made no sensation in the world, and received but one small notice in the Scripture, may it not be that other similar, or even greater, events took place at the time of that crisis of ages described in Matt. xxiv, 29-31? If that crisis came "immediately after the tribulation of those days," and before

* In the twenty-seven passages of the New Testament where this word (*μυστήριον*) occurs it always denotes some hidden thing, a mystic relation, or a spiritual truth, which, though withheld from the many, is yet made known to some. It never refers to physical phenomena, or to any thing perceptible to the natural senses of mankind. Hence the impropriety of assuming or implying that in 1 Cor. xv, 51, it must needs be a spectacle before the eyes of the world.

that generation passed away, as Jesus most solemnly affirmed, why should we insist that the supernatural events accompanying it must needs have been attested by men? Is it not quite possible that many prevalent conceptions of the resurrection and glorification of God's elect are too materialistic to be reconciled with a faithful interpretation of the Scripture? Is it so much harder to believe that God glorified many of his saints at the beginning of the gospel period, than to believe that he will do so at the close of the present dispensation? Either opinion must be received by faith in the word of Scripture revelation.*

The American editor of Meyer's Commentary on Matthew (p. 435) opposes our interpretation of this prophecy with the following: "It strains the sense of the passage, especially verse 30, quite as much as the forced construction of *εὐθὺς*, in verse 29. For, 1. The whole tenor of Scripture is against the thought that the second coming of Christ will be without the consciousness and knowledge of mankind. 2. To establish this interpretation, verse 30—'and they (all the tribes of the earth) shall see the Son of man coming'—must be taken wholly out of its obvious meaning. 3. In order to make this theory hold good, the formal judgments of the human race, described in chapter xxv, must be conceived as beginning with the fall of Jerusalem. (See chapter xxv, 31.) But the last verses of chapter xxv are a description of the closing scene which marks the end of the Messianic reign."

Taking these points in their order, we observe, 1. That our

* In Dr. Clarke's Commentary, *in loco*, we find the following rather suggestive note: "It is difficult to account for the transaction mentioned in verses 52 and 53. Some have thought that these two verses have been introduced into the text of Matthew from the Gospel of the Nazarenes. [The account is also found in the apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus.] Others think that the simple meaning is this: By the earthquake several bodies that had been buried were thrown up and exposed to view, and continued above ground till after Christ's resurrection, and were seen by many persons in the city. [Meyer favors this view, with the additional suggestion that this rending of the graves was afterward construed into a symbol of the general resurrection, and that at length the legend came to be accepted as an historical fact.] Why the graves should be opened on Friday and the bodies not be raised to life until the following Sunday is difficult to be conceived. *The place is extremely obscure.*" We think so; and therefore its value as either a proof or an illustration of any Christian doctrine is correspondingly small.—*nil.*—EDITOR.

interpretation does not pretend that the *parousia* of Christ, spoken of in Matt. xxiv, is "without the consciousness and knowledge of mankind." On the contrary, it maintains that it was the greatest event in human history, the decisive crisis between the Old and New Testament dispensations. Where does our exegesis even suggest the idea that this coming was unknown to man? Like Christ's birth at Bethlehem, and his death on the cross, and his resurrection and ascension, it was, indeed, not known to the whole world at the time of its occurrence. The name of Christ is not thus known to the world now, and never has been since the Gospel first went forth from Jerusalem; but there is nothing in "the whole tenor of Scripture," nor in any particular text, which requires the belief that the *parousia*, any more than the crucifixion, is without the knowledge of men. What is affirmed is, that such supernatural events as the resurrection and translation of saints are not of a nature to be seen by the natural eye. What Scripture disproves this proposition? 2. As for the interpretation of verse 30, we think we have fully shown above that "its obvious meaning" will depend upon the hermeneutical principles we adopt. If the passage must be literally explained, then, of course, not only verse 30, but verses 29-31 must be pressed to yield their similar, obvious meaning. And then all the parallel passages of the prophets quoted above must be treated the same way, and the obvious meaning of Isa. xix, 1, will be, that when Jehovah rode into Egypt on a swift cloud all the Egyptians saw him with the naked eye, and their hearts literally "melted" and their idols "trembled at his presence." Again we ask the question, to which we have hitherto failed to get any reply: Why should the language of Isaiah and Ezekiel and Daniel, allowed by all the best exegetes to be metaphorical or symbolical as employed in the Hebrew Scriptures, be literally understood when quoted and used, as here, by the Lord Jesus? We know that an erroneous allegorical interpretation dominated the Church for a thousand years; may it not be that an opposite extreme of dogmatic literalism has been similarly misleading? Finally, 3. The judgment described in Matt. xxv, 31-46, while "beginning with the fall of Jerusalem," does not, according to our interpretation, end there, but continues necessarily until all things are subjected to Christ, and he deliv-

ers up the kingdom to the Father. How can it, then, exclude any scene either at the beginning or end of the Messianic reign?

We submit the foregoing exegesis to the candid judgment of thoughtful men. This Scripture has ever been recognized as beset with difficulties, and eminent divines in all the Churches have differed in opinion touching its meaning. We have aimed to show that most, if not all, of the difficulties arise from dogmatic prepossessions. He who under holy vows is "ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word"—who, with profound reverence for the Holy Scriptures, believes "that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith"—will not be content to let others do his thinking for him. He will prayerfully search for "the true understanding" of the divine word, allow fullest liberty in non-essentials, and condemn the requiring of any man to believe what God's word has not made unmistakably clear.

NOTE.—At the end of Matt. xxiv, Dr. Clarke, who finds the fulfillment of all its predictions in the destruction of Jerusalem, makes this general reflection: "The reader has no doubt observed in the preceding chapter a series of most striking and solemn predictions, [which were] fulfilled in a very literal, awful, and dreadful manner. Christ has foretold the ruin of the Jewish people and the destruction of their polity, and in such a circumstantial manner as none else could do but He under whose eye are all events, and in whose hands are the government and direction of all things. . . . And the fulfillment has been as circumstantial as the predictions." And Alford, at the end of chap. xxv, says: "Without raising any question respecting the doctrine of a future, general, simultaneous judgment of all men, with scenic and spectacular accompaniments, as it is supposed to be taught in later portions of Scripture, it may be safely averred that it is at least very questionable whether there is, in either of the three parables of chap. xxv, any reference to such an event."—EDITOR.

ART. III.—CHARLES LAMB'S ESSAYS.

SOUTHEY, writing to his friend Caroline Bowles concerning Charles Lamb's genius, said: "There are some reputations which will not keep, but Lamb's is not of that kind. His memory will retain its fragrance as long as the best spice that ever was expended upon one of the Pharaohs." In contrast with this high estimate of Lamb's literary work and of this strong faith in the indestructibility of his fame, stands the contemptuous opinion of the grim philosopher of Chelsea, who said of Lamb: "I saw him once; once I gradually felt to have been enough for me. Poor Lamb! Such a 'divine genius' you could find in the London world only." At another time, when the humor of Lamb's essays was praised in his hearing, he exclaimed, in a tone of ineffable contempt: "Humor! he has no humor. It was only a thin streak of cockney wit. I have known scores of Scotch moorland farmers who for *humor* could have blown Lamb to the zenith!" "The pictorial effect of this figure," says Mr. Wylie in his *Personal Reminiscences of Carlyle*, "delivered in a high Annandale key, especially when the speaker came to the last clause of the sentence, it is impossible for print to convey—the listener saw poor Lamb spinning off into space, propelled thither by the contemptuous kick of a lusty Dandie Dinmont, in hodden-gray, from the moors of Galloway or Ayrshire."

Lamb has been dead but little more than half a century. It is too soon, therefore, to determine whether Southey's prediction of the perpetuity of his fame will become a prophecy fulfilled, or whether the caprice of the reading public will finally imbibe Carlyle's scorn and blow the reputation of the gentle Elia "to the zenith." At present probabilities favor Southey's anticipations, since the popular demand in England for Lamb's writings is so pronounced that Mr. Alfred Ainger has recently edited a new edition of his works, and written a condensed sketch of his life for Mr. Morley's admirable series of biographies, "English Men of Letters." Mr. Ainger has enriched his edition of Lamb with numerous explanatory notes, which, says an English critic, "make capital reading, and tell us all we ought or want to know." These notes are aids to the enjoy-

ment of the essays, because they identify the persons hidden beneath manifold pseudonyms, elucidate their numerous and sometimes uncertain allusions and citations, and bring certain biographical details from their hiding-places into the light.* It is Mr. Ainger's purpose to annotate Lamb's very charming letters in like manner, and to publish them in a volume uniform with this edition of his works. The justification of this speculation, if speculation it can be called, is in the fact stated by a recent well-informed English writer, that "Lamb's popularity shows no signs of waning. Even that most extraordinary compound, the rising generation of readers, whose taste in literature is as erratic as it is pronounced, . . . the dogs of whose criticism, not yet full grown; will, when let loose, as some day they must be, cry havoc among established reputations—read their Lamb, letters as well as essays, with laughter and with love." It would appear, therefore, that at least another generation of readers will contribute to the falsification of Carlyle's opinion and to the fulfillment of Southey's prophecy.

Lamb's first literary ventures included a tragedy, a farce, the story of *Rosamund Gray*, several sonnets, and sundry miscellaneous poems. But though the poetic portions of these productions entitle him to a place among the minor poets of England, their merits are not such as would have, of themselves, preserved his memory from that greedy oblivion which remorselessly devours the names of the vast majority of writers. Of his tragedy *John Woodvil*, Mr. Taine says: "It is an archaic tragedy which we might fancy to have been written during Elizabeth's reign." His friend Coleridge called it "an over-imitation of the antique in style." The *Edinburgh Review* condemned it most unmercifully, and without fair discrimination. Kemble, then manager of Drury Lane Theater, declined it as unsuited to the stage. Nevertheless, though lacking in plot, in well-sustained dialogue, and in the individuality of its characters, the resemblance of its diction to that of the writers of the time of Shakespeare drew the attention of literary men to the half-forgotten excellencies of the old dramatists. It contained one or two passages, however, of such rare beauty that Godwin, the author of *Caleb Williams*, *Political Justice*, etc., supposed them to be borrowed from some unknown dramatist of Eliza-

* An American edition of these annotated volumes is in the market.

beth's time, and wrote him, inquiring who he might be. His farce, *Mr. H*—, was hissed from the stage, Lamb himself, with characteristic candor, indorsing the popular verdict by hissing with the rest. *Rosamund Gray*, though, as Shelley called it, "a lovely thing, characterized by exquisite delicacy of feeling, deep pathos, religious emotion," and by what Mr. Ainger very properly calls "an indefinable charm of style," is yet so improbable in its incidents, so incongruous in its parts, and so lacking in that thread of continuity which is essential to a well-constructed tale, that it indicated latent rather than developed genius. His poems and sonnets attracted the attention of Coleridge, Lloyd, Southey, and other distinguished men, but would scarcely have outlived his own time but for their association with his delightful essays, which, with his charming letters, bid fair, as stated above, to be the trumpeters of his reputation to posterity. Or, to cite the language of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, they form "the chief corner-stone in the small but classic temple of his fame."

These essays, most of which are known to all readers of English literature as the "Essays of Elia," contain the fruits of Lamb's early familiarity with such old English authors as the dramatists of Shakespeare's times, Jeremy Taylor, Sir Thomas Browne, Thomas Fuller, etc. It is supposed that he and his sister found such books as these in the library of Mr. Salt, who was their father's employer. Writing of her, he says: "She was tumbled early, by accident or design, into a spacious closet of good old English reading, without much selection or prohibition, and browsed at will upon that fair and wholesome pasturage." The thoughts absorbed and begotten by that miscellaneous reading, his impressions of the men and things he had met, his fantastic conceits, his shrewd observations on society, and the sad experiences of his own life were freely poured into his essays, making them a transcript of his singularly constituted self. Following the example of Sir Thomas Browne, who in this thing was an imitator of Montaigne, as well as of Addison, the prince of English essayists, Lamb wrote his essays in the first person, thereby giving them a somewhat egotistic aspect. But his egotism was not, like Montaigne's, the expression of offensive vanity, but only of a genial friend talking to you about matters of common interest, with a good-

natured familiarity which puts you at your ease and commands your confidence. In kindness of temper Elia reminds one of the *Spectator*, as he does also in the quiet humor which exhales from every page like fragrance from flowers, and which, though rarely provoking a downright laugh, yet keeps the lips of an appreciative reader constantly rippling with smiles. Elia's genius was not creative like Addison's. Hence in his essays there is no such realistic embodiment of humor as the immortal Sir Roger de Coverley. Neither is there any thing so deeply thoughtful as Addison's essays on the "Immateriality of the Soul," on "Good Intentions," etc.; for though Elia had flashes of deep thought, he was neither a profound nor a continuous thinker. Continuity "teased" him, he said. To instruct, to moralize, or to reform society was not his aim. But he loved to ramble in the realm of his eccentric fancy, and to gather such facts and fictions, light jests, shrewd observations, and tender recollections as might, says Mrs. Oliphant, "transport his readers in a moment all unwittingly from laughter into weeping, and to play upon all the strings of their hearts." Hence the charm of his essays lies in the quaintness of his fancies, in the oddity of his phrases, in the tenderness of his pathos, in the perspicuity and variety of his style, in his humorous delineations of character, in occasional gleams of penetrative thought, in keen criticism, and in his power of graphic description. These qualities, animated by a sweet, gentle, and sometimes frolicsome spirit, make his essays delightful reading, not perhaps to general and superficial readers, but to such as have the sympathies and the tastes, intellectual and esthetic, necessary to the appreciation of their peculiarities.

Southey, notwithstanding his strong attachment to Lamb, objected to his essays that they lacked "sound (or *sane*, as Southey wrote) religious feeling." No candid admirer of our essayist can satisfactorily meet this objection of the poet further than to say that it is true of only a few of his papers. Lamb did not profess to be a religious man, as evangelical Protestants understand that phrase. In his early manhood, at the time he was stricken by the tragic event which shadowed his whole after life—the insanity of his sister and the sad death of his mother—he held the belief of the Unitarians, and wrote to Coleridge, saying: "God be praised, Coleridge, . . . that in the

midst of the terrible scene I preserved a tranquillity not of despair. Is it folly or sin in me to say that it was a religious principle that most supported me?" But a few years later we find him writing to his friend Walter Wilson: "I have had a time of seriousness, and I have known the importance and reality of a religious belief. Latterly I acknowledge much of my seriousness has gone off, . . . but I still retain at bottom a conviction of the truth and a certainty of the usefulness of religion." Beyond this conviction, which did not control either his feelings or conduct, Lamb never went. As Talfourd, his biographer, reluctantly confesses, Lamb lived in the present, striving to alleviate the great griefs of his sad life, not by seeking the rich consolations of a Christian faith and hope, which he so greatly needed, but by "living entirely in the present, enjoying with tremulous zest the scene, and making some genial but sad amends for wanting all the prospective of life by cleaving with fondness to its nearest objects." This determination to find relief from the unending sorrow occasioned by the constantly recurring insanity of his sister, in literary occupation, in the excitement of strong drink, and in the companionship of witty convivialists, begot in him a deep and abiding dread of death. Had this shrinking originated in a fear of what would come after death, it might have led him into the possession of that Christian feeling the absence of which, in his essays, Southey regrets. An illustration of this lack, and also of his unsound, not to say insane, treatment at times of religious themes, is to be found in the essay entitled *New Year's Eve*. In this paper, after giving strong and sinewy expression to his dread of dying, he closes with a reckless laugh at "those puling fears of death," and with a wild bacchanalian call "for another cup of wine." This odd admixture of levity with seriousness was probably the occasion, as it is the justification, of Southey's regret. It was indeed characteristic of Lamb in his convivial hours. Happily, however, it only appears occasionally in his essays. That it crops out in them at all every lover of the gentle Elia must join with Southey in regretting, seeing that it is the dead fly in a pot of precious ointment.

Coleridge, in his *Table Talk*, refers apologetically to a marked moral defect in Lamb's essays, especially conspicuous in the one *On the Artificial Comedy of the Last Century*, and in an-

other *On Some of the Old Actors*. In these papers, as in some others, though in lesser degree, he shows that tolerance of evil both in men and books which, says Sara Coleridge, "was so much remarked in Charles Lamb, and was in so good a man really remarkable." In the first of the essays just named, while admitting the immorality of the dramas of Wycherly and Congreve, he nevertheless advocates their occasional presentation on the stage on the flimsy plea that spectators, knowing the unreality of the characters before them, are not morally injured by the impure actions simulated and the vile sentiments uttered by the performers. It requires a very tolerant charity to concede that a man so acutely observant of men and things as Charles Lamb was, could really believe men and women could witness scenic representations of loose conduct and listen to impure dialogues without having their imaginations defiled and their hearts stimulated toward evil. Coleridge tries to excuse this sophistical plea by saying of its author, that "Nothing ever left a stain on the gentle creature's mind, which looked upon the degraded men and things around him like moonshine on a dunghill, which shines and takes no pollution. All things are shadows to him, except those which move his affections." This apology implies, that Lamb could sit as the spectator of an impure play with a mind so absorbed in its intellectual features, and in the archaic diction of its dialogue, as to be morally and emotionally insensible to those parts from which a truly good man's moral instincts naturally recoil with disgust. This, though scarcely credible, may be the philosophy of the fact in Lamb's case, seeing that he was a singularly constituted being. But men generally are not unconscious moonbeams, but creatures with passions and imaginations predisposed to evil, and cannot therefore voluntarily look on scenic representations of wickedness without absorbing its infection. Hence the Christian moralist, who appreciates the many excellences of Elia, cannot easily suppress a wish that his essay *On the Artificial Comedy* had never been written. The other essay named above is in its first part an admirable specimen of that Shakespearean criticism in which Lamb excelled; but its final paragraphs contain the same pernicious theory, and no sound moralist can approve them.

Talfourd says that Lamb "did not merely love his friends in

spite of their errors, but he loved them errors and all; *so near to him was every thing human.*" After this latter statement one might logically expect to find the philanthropic spirit breathing throughout Elia's essays. Yet it is not to be found in them at all, and Judge Talfourd affirms that "perhaps he had less sympathy with philanthropic schemers for the improvement of the world than with any other class of men." To unhappy *individuals* with whom he was brought into personal contact he was kind even to a fault, but the range of his affections, like the sphere in which he moved, was narrow. It comprehended individuals, not classes. He was humane, but not a humanitarian. We see this limitation in his essay entitled, *The Praise of Chimney Sweepers*, and also in one on *The Decay of Beggars in the Metropolis*. In the former he revels with frolicsome delight over the humorous side of the wretched lives of the child sweeps, whom he designates "dim specks, poor blots, innocent blacknesses," and describes an annual feast given them by his merry friend, James White, in London; but, unlike Sydney Smith in his essay on the same subject, he utters no protest against that heartlessness of society which suffered little boys to be subjected to the tortures inseparable from their daily task of ascending blindfold the crooked flues of soot-begrimmed chimneys. He makes no plea for a law forbidding such unpardonable cruelty. Not that he is without sympathy with the unhappy little wretches. He looks upon them kindly. He seeks to stir like sympathies in the breast of his reader, saying to him, "If thou meetest one of these small gentry in thy early rambles, it is good to give him a penny. It is better to give him twopence. If it be starving weather, and to the proper troubles of his hard occupation a pair of kibed heels (no unusual accompaniment) be superadded, the demand on thy humanity will surely rise to a tester." This is the language of a kind heart stirred to feeling by the actual sight of individual suffering, but it is not the expression of a mind that sees humanity degraded in the subjugation of little children to such shocking treatment. Moreover, by making merry over the ludicrous side of the poor sweep's character, Lamb fails to call forth more than superficial sympathy with his woes. His humor did not ally itself to the broad aims of philanthropy.

In like manner, his essay *On the Decay of Beggars*, viewed

as a bit of humor, is exquisite. It clothes the mendicant in the robes of Harlequin, transmutes his rags into the toga of a free-man, and with unreasoning short-sightedness denounces the laws framed to prevent mendicity as edicts for the persecution of innocents! It is not, therefore, the utterance of a philanthropic mind seeking to reform and elevate humanity, but of a mind whose sense of the grotesque was stronger than its repugnance to a habit of vagrancy which was as demoralizing to those who adopted it as it was annoying to the community which permitted it.

But though these objections hold good against a few of his essays, yet, taken as a whole, they are as sound and healthful as they are entertaining. In a literary sense they are also profitable reading. If not deeply thoughtful, they yet quicken thought by their many suggestive observations. If they add little to one's stores of knowledge, they do nevertheless warm the imagination, mellow the sympathies, excite kindly affections, and give birth to pleasant emotions. They relieve the weary mind and beguile it into a condition of pleasant restfulness. Their spirit, now quaintly playful and then tenderly pathetic, is infectious, and he who once learns to appreciate their peculiar qualities never loses his relish for them. He turns to them again and again as Lamb's friends were wont to repeat their visits to his hospitable hearthside, seeking mental refreshment from his sprightly conversation, playful puns, and original observations.

Chief, perhaps, among his more serious essays is the *Confessions of a Drunkard*. As is too well known, poor Lamb was addicted to drinking; not, Talfourd assures us, because he loved the contents of the ale tankard or the spirit bottle, but partly because he fancied that "it lighted up his fading fancy, enriched his humor, and impelled the struggling thought or beautiful image into day;" partly because he sought amid the gloom of afflictions which environed him to "snatch a fearful joy;" and partly because, as at the commencement of the evil habit, he was moved by the tendencies of his constitution to inherited insanity, and by his struggles to overcome his native bashfulness and to control his stuttering tongue.

Of the effect of the intoxicating cup in setting Lamb's mental machinery in motion, Mr. Ainger, while admitting that it

sometimes stimulated him to talk brilliantly, testifies that it "often set free less lovable springs of fancy" within him. At such times he was perverse, contradictory, and discourteous. Then, says Mr. Patmore, one of his warmest admirers, "to those who did not know him . . . Lamb often passed for something between an imbecile, a brute, and a buffoon." It is indeed pitiful that so gifted and so generous a soul should have been enslaved to such a vice. Yet he certainly was so, though not so absolutely as to be completely wrecked by it. Perhaps it was because of this partial enslavement that he was able to write the terrible picture of a drunkard's struggle contained in his *Confessions of a Drunkard*. The iron hand of the merciless enchanter held him in its pitiless grip. He wrote, therefore, from experience, albeit he had not then tasted, nor did he ever taste, all the woes he so graphically describes in this famous essay. By what he did know himself, and by what he had seen in others, he was able to conceive of the agonies, the remorse, the imbecility, the buffoonery, which lie in wait for the slave of the wine-cup. Hence his essay is perhaps as strong a plea for total abstinence from strong drink as can be found in English literature.

Among the most touchingly beautiful but least humorous of these essays are the *Dream Children*, and *The Child Angel*. The former he calls a "revery," the latter "a dream." Both are remarkable for simplicity of statement and delicacy of feeling. Professor Shaw does not overpraise them in saying that they are "inexpressibly beautiful, and worthy of Jean Paul."

In *Grace before Meat* Lamb gives us a humorous satire on the irreverence involved in asking the divine blessing at a richly laden table while the thoughts of the hungry guests are more intent on the steaming viands than on Him whose approval they affect to crave. But for the doubt it casts on the propriety and duty of an ancient and beautiful Christian custom, this essay might be esteemed as a deserving rebuke of those to whom asking a blessing at the table is little else than a form of thankful speech which, not being begotten of gratitude, is irreverent mockery. In *Imperfect Sympathies* we have what Mr. Ainger designates that "famous analysis of Scotch character, perhaps the cleverest passage, in its union of fine ob-

servation and felicity of phrase, in the whole of Lamb's writings." It has also disquisitions on Jews and Quakers which, though less searching and brilliant, are excellent and diverting. Of Jews he says, with sly humor, "I have, *in the abstract*, no disrespect for the Jews." Concerning Quakers he says, "I love Quaker principles. It does me good for the rest of the day when I meet any of their people in my path. . . . But I cannot like the Quakers (as Desdemona would say) to live with them."

Among Lamb's most humorous essays must be reckoned that almost universally known bundle of incongruities called *A Dissertation upon Roast Pig*. Equally amusing, perhaps, though less grotesque in its humor, is his sketch of *Captain Jackson*, whose philosophy taught him, though "steeped in poverty up to the lips, to fancy himself all the while chin-deep in riches." His essay on *Modern Gallantry* is a sharp satire on men who, while conventionally polite to women of wealth and social standing, habitually treat poor women with contemptuous disrespect, thereby showing that they have not that genuine reverence for womanhood itself which breathes in the spirit of this essay.

He who would rightly appreciate these Essays as a whole should first read either those of them which are autobiographical, or Lamb's biography. As Mr. Ainger justly remarks, "It is the man, Charles Lamb, that contributes the enduring charm of his written words." And Lamb, while apparently intending to write for the amusement of his readers, has with seeming unconsciousness given them, at least in part, the story of his life in his essays. In *The Old Benchers of the Inner Temple*, for example, one finds a fine picture of the place of his birth, the law courts of London, where his father lived as the servant and clerk of one of the "benchers," named Samuel Salt, whom he delineates, as he does other leading barristers, with a graphic pen. Under the name of Lovell, he describes the remarkable character of his intelligent father with the pencil of an artist and the admiring affection of a son. In his *Recollections of Christ's Hospital*, and its sequel, *Christ's Hospital Five-and-Thirty Years Ago*, we see him at the school where he spent seven years acquiring the education by which his rare native qualities were developed, and where he began that friendship with the "inspired charity boy," Coleridge,

which had such an important influence on his own subsequent literary associations and pursuits, and where, despite the unfeeling nature of his boy associates, the severity and heartlessness of the school discipline, of his own stuttering speech and delicate frame, he won the sympathy of all, and the reputation of being a fair student and "a gentle and amiable boy." In *The South Sea House* we have a sketch of the house of trade where, at fifteen, he began his long career of clerkship in the companionship of one Evans, the cashier, who, he says, "was melancholy as a gib-cat over his counter;" of Thomas Tame, who "had the air and stoop of a nobleman;" of John Tipp, who thought "an accountant the greatest character in the world and himself the greatest accountant in it;" of Henry Man, the wit, the polished man of letters and the *author* of the *South Sea House*; also of "the obstreperous, rattling, rattle-headed Plumer." These characters with fictitious names were real personages whom he describes with the same unique skill in delineation which we find in *The Old Benchers*.

His essay entitled *My Relations* pretends to give a descriptive sketch of his cousin James Elia, but really contains a masterly analysis of his brother John's character. He calls him "an inexplicable cousin, made up of contradictory principles, the genuine child of impulse, the frigid philosopher of prudence. With always some fire-new project in his brain, he is the systematic opponent of innovation; . . . determined by his own sense in every thing, he commends *you* to the guidance of common sense on all occasions. With a touch of the eccentric in all which he does and says, he is only anxious that *you* should not commit yourself by doing any thing absurd or singular. He is as courageous as Charles of Sweden, upon instinct; chary of his person, upon principle, as a traveling Quaker." Rambling on in this style, he completes the portrait of his "broad, burly, jovial" brother, who was as selfish as he was plausible and pretensions of all the proprieties. In doing this he, insensibly, perhaps, made him an admirably drawn type of a class of men who persuade themselves that they possess all the virtues and all practical wisdom, but who are in reality the embodiments of an all-absorbing selfishness, of vanity so full-blown that it deludes them into a belief that their controlling vice is a splendid virtue!

Not many months after the death of this brother, Lamb wrote the *Dream Children*, mentioned above, in which, among other kind words, he says, "I bore his death, as I thought, pretty well at first, but afterward it haunted and haunted me; and though I did not cry and take it to heart as some do, and as I think he would have done if I had died, yet I missed him all day long, and knew not till then how much I had loved him. I missed his kindness, I missed his crossness, and I wished him alive again, to be quarreling with him—for we quarreled sometimes—rather than not have him again." To estimate these kind words aright, one needs to recollect that they were written of a brother who, though in affluent circumstances, had so shirked his filial and fraternal obligations as to leave Charles when in receipt of only a pitifully meager income to take sole care of their decrepit father and insane sister. Read in the light of this discreditable, not to say shameful, conduct of his selfish brother, the words become strong proof that his gentle spirit was a rich fountain of affectionate and forgiving kindness.

Mackery End in Hertfordshire, Blakesmoor in II—shire, and *Old China* also contain touching memories of his family connections and of his own life. Our space permits remark only on the last named essay, which is a delightful picture of himself and his sister. It describes him and his "Cousin Bridget," his *nom de plume* for Mary his sister, sitting at the tea-table drinking their "hyson" for the first time from a new set of China recently purchased. Having spoken to Bridget of the improvement in their circumstances which enabled them to buy this elegant set of china, that charming woman is made to say:

I wish the good old times would come again, when we were not quite so rich. I do not mean that I want to be poor, but there was a middle state in which I am sure we were a great deal happier. A purchase is but a purchase, now that you have money enough and to spare. Formerly it used to be a triumph. When we coveted a cheap luxury—and O, how much ado I had to get you to consent in those times!—we were used to have a debate two or three days before, and to weigh the *for* and *against*, and think what we might spare it out of, and what saving we could hit upon that should be an equivalent. A thing was worth paying then, when we felt the money that we paid for it.

Do you remember the brown suit which you made to hang upon you till all your friends cried shame upon you, it grew so

threadbare? and all because of that folio *Beaumont and Fletcher*, which you dragged home late at night from Baker's in Covent Garden? Do you remember how we eyed it for weeks before we made up our minds to the purchase, and had not come to a determination till it was near ten o'clock of the Saturday night when you set off from Islington fearing you should be too late—and when the old book-seller with some grumbling opened his shop and by the twinkling taper (for he was setting bedwards) lighted out the relic from his dusty treasures, and when you lugged it home wishing it were twice as cumbersome, and when you presented it to me, and when we were exploring the perfectness of it (*collating*, you called it), and while I was repairing some of the loose leaves with paste, which your patience would not suffer to be left till day-break—was there no pleasure in being a poor man? or can those neat, black clothes which you wear now and are so careful to keep brushed, since we have become rich and finical, give you half the honest vanity with which you flaunted it about in that overworn suit for four or five weeks longer than you should have done to pacify your conscience for the mighty sum of fifteen—or sixteen—shillings, was it? a great affair we thought it then, which you had lavished on the old folio. Now you can afford to buy any book that pleases you, but I do not see that you ever bring me home any nice old purchases now!

In this homely yet felicitous style Bridget pursues her story of the pleasures they formerly wrung out of their poverty, until the essayist finally tells us of his smiles at “the phantom of wealth which her dear imagination had conjured up out of a clear income of a poor—hundred pounds a year.” In replying to Bridget, he shrewdly avoids contradicting her by saying, “It is true we were happier when we were poorer, but we were also younger, my cousin.” He then suggests to her that their increasing age made competence more desirable, necessary even, than when they were younger and better able to endure the stress and self-denials of poverty. The whole essay is conceived in a delightful spirit. It is doubtless the substance of a real conversation, and though Lamb did not so intend, is pleasantly illustrative of that much-despised apothegm of the Master of wisdom which affirms, that “a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things he possesseth.”

Taken together, these essays are unique in that they contain that combination of wit with pathos which constitutes true humor, and which, as before stated, is their principal but not their only charm. It is this quality which makes it tolerably certain that they will always have, if not a large circle

of readers, yet, as De Quincey predicted, a select few who, having first learned to admire what, in spite of his faults, was admirable in the man, will read his writings with pleasure, wondering how genius cramped as his was by the hard conditions of his life could have produced such an uncommon series of papers.

It is true that many other men of genius have fought their way to success through obstacles seemingly unsurmountable. But Lamb's environments were exceptionally unfavorable to literary pursuits. His father, though possessing a naturally vigorous mind, was only a barrister's servant. Hence Charles Lamb spent his childhood in circumstances which, but for the affectionate care of Mary, his intelligent sister, could have contributed very little to the awakening of his powers. When seven years old he became a scholar in the school of "Christ's Hospital," where he was handicapped by a peculiarly bashful nature, incurably stammering speech, a shambling gait, and an oddity of manner eminently fitted to make him the butt of his thoughtless school-fellows. Happily, however, his uncommon gentleness won them to treat him with kindness, and also moved his masters to grant him unusual indulgences, and to suffer his sister to watch over him as his ministering angel. Here he remained until he was fifteen, when, being unfitted for the Church because of the defect in his speech, he was compelled by the rules of the institution to quit it with a scarcely half-finished classical education. The needs of his family then made it necessary that he should begin to earn his own living by accepting a clerkship procured for him by his elder brother in the South Sea House. After a brief service in that establishment he secured a better position in the East India House. In his twenty-first year he was smitten with insanity, which was in the family blood, and spent six weeks "in a mad-house." Whether his madness was developed by disappointment in love, or whether it led to the termination of his courtship, is uncertain, albeit it is certain that from about this time he ceased to be the recognized lover of the "mild, fair-haired, blue-eyed" Alice who had held possession of his affections. The dissolution of his hope of taking her to wife wounded him deeply.

Scarcely had he recovered the right use of his reason before

his dear and only sister, Mary, was seized with a fit of madness in which she stabbed and killed her mother! It was in this tragic emergency that Lamb displayed the nobility of his nature. His brother insisted that Mary should be placed permanently in an insane asylum. The city authorities, in view of the violence of her mania, were also disposed to insist that this should be done. But Charles said, No! As a temporary patient it was absolutely necessary to place her in a hospital for treatment. But, though his salary was small, his father dependent upon him, and his selfish brother, John, refused to bear any part of the pecuniary burden, Charles resolutely assumed the care and support of his sister. This purpose required him to abandon all hope of marriage for himself, and the consecration of all his means and energies to Mary's well-being. It was a great sacrifice. Yet he made it cheerfully through the remaining thirty-eight years of his life, during which Mary's insane attacks never ceased to recur at brief intervals, though without the violence of the first. This self-forgetful brother provided for her and watched over her with unceasing tenderness. Her affliction was a terrible trial to both. They never left home together for a recreative journey without taking a strait-jacket in their trunk. As her attacks were generally preceded by premonitory symptoms, it was his habit, when they were coming on, to take her by the hand and lead her to an asylum for treatment; and one of their intimate friends speaks of meeting them one day walking hand in hand, weeping as they went, to the abode of mentally diseased persons. It is this fraternal devotion, never excelled by mortal man, which glorifies the character of Charles Lamb, which pleads with his readers not to judge him too severely for his unquestionable faults, but to think of him, if not with complacent, yet with pitiful, affection. Besides being plunged into deepest grief while she was absent from his solitary table, as she was so frequently for weeks together when under treatment, he was ever on the rack of cruel expectation when she was with him of a recurrence of the dreaded symptoms of a fresh attack. Without the least exaggeration, Mr. Talfourd called this "a life-long association as free from every alloy of selfishness, and as remarkable for moral beauty, as this world ever witnessed in brother and sister."

With these facts before him, and with the recollection that for more than thirty years Lamb's days were spent "a prisoner to the desk," which he calls being "chained to a galley thirty years," and that his humble home was much visited evenings by his literary friends and convivial associates, no man can read his essays, and his almost equally interesting letters, without wondering at that virility of genius which achieved so much under circumstances so exceptionally oppressive and disheartening. Neither can one review his sad life, disfigured as it was on one side by failings and faults which no Christian conscience can excuse, and glorified on the other by an unselfish fraternal affection which none but a churl can refuse to regard with unqualified admiration, without being reminded of the rich young Pharisee, of whom, though he refused to pay the price of discipleship, it is said that "Jesus, beholding him, loved him." In like manner, despite his faults, he who beholds Charles Lamb arrayed in the beauty of an unexcelled fraternal affection loves him, yet regretting, as Jesus did the young Pharisee's folly, the defects which marred his character.

ART. IV.—THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

THE first Lutherans to settle in this country were emigrants from Holland, who about the year 1623 located in New Amsterdam, now New York. Being fewer in number than their Reformed fellow-countrymen, they were refused the presence of a Lutheran pastor, denied the privilege of holding a Lutheran service, and were variously persecuted for resisting the effort made to extort from them the promise to bring up their children in the Dordrecht faith. The fine for preaching a Lutheran sermon was £100, and that for attending a Lutheran service was £25. Their "conventicles" were broken up, and many were imprisoned.* They finally obtained full religious liberty in 1664, when the colony fell into the hands of the British.

In the year 1638 two ship-loads of Swedish Lutherans

* Broadhead's *History of New York*, vol. i, pp. 582, 617, 634, 642; also, *Documentary History of New York*, vol. iii, p. 103.

entered the Delaware, and took up their abode in and around Fort Christina, now Wilmington, Del. Here they immediately erected a house of worship, and enjoyed the ministrations of the Rev. Reorus Torkillus, who had accompanied them from Sweden. Their second pastor, Campanius, in 1649 translated Luther's Small Catechism into the language of the Delawares, and preached the Gospel to the Indians several years before John Eliot began his missionary labor in New England.

The tide of German emigration to this country set in about the year 1680, but we have no account of a German Lutheran congregation having been organized, or of a German Lutheran pastor, until 1703, when the Rev. Justus Falkner began to preach in Montgomery County, Pa. From 1708 to 1713 colonies of Lutherans settled along the Hudson, and organized congregations which still exist in Dutchess, Columbia, and Ulster Counties in the State of New York. During the first two or three decades of the eighteenth century, large numbers of Lutherans settled in Pennsylvania, principally along the Swatara and the Tulpehocken, and in and around Philadelphia. The spiritual destitution of these new-comers was so great that in 1733 they sent a deputation to Germany who reported themselves as being "in a land full of sects and heresy, without ministers and teachers, schools, churches, and books."

In 1734 a colony of refugees from Romish persecution in the Salzburg, with two ministers, settled on the Savannah, in Georgia; and a little later settlements of Lutherans began to be made in Virginia and North Carolina, and before the middle of the century a Lutheran Church had been organized as far north as Waldoborough, Maine. But these various communities of Lutherans were widely separated from each other, and had no bond of union except a common language and a common faith. With few exceptions they were alike destitute of the living ministry and of the means of grace, save as they had carried with them the Bible, the Catechism, the Hymn-book and Arndt's *True Christianity*, by which they still supported the glow of piety in their hearts.

The year 1742 opened a new era in the arrival of Dr. Henry Melchior Mühlenberg, who is justly esteemed the Patriarch of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. This truly apostolic man, thoroughly educated, deeply imbued with

the spirit of Halleian pietism, and well endowed with administrative talent, traveled and labored incessantly for forty-five years, gathering together and preaching to the thousands of Lutherans whom he found in this land of his adoption. In the year 1748, when, so far as is now known, there were only eleven Lutheran ministers in the country, Mühlenberg, with five other pastors and a few laymen, organized the ministerium of Pennsylvania, which exists to-day with 238 ministers, 408 congregations, and 91,619 communicants. Still, for half a century or more the growth of the Lutheran Church was slow. Very few ministers came from the fatherland, and very few could be educated in this country; the use of the English language in the ministrations of the sanctuary was discouraged; and the young people who had not learned the German were advised by pastors and church-councils to connect themselves with the Episcopal Church, which at that time was regarded as the English *Lutheran Church*.*

As a result of these and of other untoward influences, at the opening of the nineteenth century there were less than 70 Lutheran ministers in the United States, and probably not more than 25,000 communicants, with no schools, with no periodicals, and with scarcely any preaching in the English language. Now and then a minister was educated in non-Lutheran institutions and by Lutheran pastors, but still the supply was inadequate, and the growth was so slow that by the year 1820 there were only 103 Lutheran ministers in the United States. In this year four of the five synods which then existed united in forming the General Synod. Two of these district synods soon withdrew from the General Synod, then again united with it, and finally withdrew again. But from the organizing of the General Synod rapid progress began to be made, as the following decennial exhibits plainly show:

Date.	Ministers.	Congregations.	Communicants.
1823	175	900	38,036
1833	337	1,017	59,358
1843	430	1,371	147,000
1853	900	1,750	200,000
1863	1,431	2,677	285,217
1873	2,309	4,115	485,085
1883	3,504	6,171	801,236

* The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England are taken very largely from the Augsburg Confession, and its liturgy almost bodily from Lutheran liturgies.

This marvelous growth is due to organization, to the founding of institutions of learning, to the use of the press, to missionary activity, and the large foreign immigration; and yet it is estimated that only about two fifths of the foreign Lutherans landing on these shores ever find their way into connection with the Lutheran Church. Thousands of them enter the Churches of other denominations; but very many, perhaps well-nigh one half, bewildered and secularized by their new surroundings, both in our great cities and on the prairies of the West, become entirely indifferent to religion. But notwithstanding her many disadvantages and drawbacks, the Lutheran Church has come to be a recognized power in the land, and is destined to exert an important and far-reaching influence on the moral and religious future of the country, although it must be confessed that her efficiency for aggressive work is greatly diminished by her unfortunate divisions, which may be traced in part to resistance to the unwarranted and tyrannical measures employed by William III. and his subalterns to effect the "Prussian Union," but mainly to the fact that she is in new and strange environments of law, language, civilization, and religious life. Thus from sheer necessity she is forced to use several different languages in worship and in the conduct of her ecclesiastical affairs, in her institutions of learning, and the issues of the press—which bring about misunderstandings, and produce separations.

The *Evangelical Lutheran Church* is the common historical name and title of the four general Lutheran bodies in the United States;* and neither of these would arrogate to itself the attributive *evangelical* to the disparagement of the others; for as against Romanism, Deism, and Rationalism they all alike "believe, teach, and confess that the only rule and standard according to which all doctrines and teachers alike ought to be tried and judged is the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments alone." All alike acknowledge the three ecumenical creeds, and "reject all heresies and doctrines which, in opposition to these, have been introduced into the Church of God."† The differences, as will hereinafter

* All the statistics of this article are for the year 1886, except where otherwise stated.

† Form of Concord, Epitome and Sol. Dec.

appear, are those of relation to the Lutheran confessional writings of the sixteenth century.

THE GENERAL SYNOD.

This body was organized at Hagerstown, Md., in the year 1820, with four synods. At first it had no doctrinal basis other than that of the word of God; but after a few years it adopted the Augsburg Confession in a modified form. Subject to various divisions and accretions it reached its greatest strength in 1860, when it numbered 864 ministers and 164,000 communicants, or "two thirds of the entire Lutheran Church in this country." In 1861 four synods in the Southern States withdrew in consequence of the civil war.* In 1866-68 five other synods withdrew for alleged confessional reasons, thus leaving the General Synod in 1869 with 572 ministers, and 86,770 communicants. Its present strength is 910 ministers, 1,449 congregations, 138,988 communicants. The secretaries of the different boards report receipts as follows for 1886: Foreign Missions, \$43,222 78, with "eleven American missionaries, assisted by 110 native Christian men who devote all their time and labor, as evangelists and preachers, to the work of publishing the Gospel to their brethren who are still in spiritual darkness." "Besides these, 130 others are engaged in teaching schools in which Bible instruction forms a prominent part." Home Missions, \$35,360 95, with 98 missionaries. Beneficiary Education, \$14,005 20. Church Extension from May 1, 1885, to December 31, 1886, \$44,653 58.

The confessional basis of the General Synod "as amended and declared adopted" in 1869 is: "We receive and hold, with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of our fathers, the word of God as contained in the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine word, and of the faith of our Church founded upon that word."

* In 1863 these Southern synods formed themselves into a new General Synod, giving as their reasons for such action: 1. Difference from the Northern brethren "not only in politics, but in moral and Christian instruction;" 2. The war carried on with "the spirit of demons;" 3. The new political conditions; 4. Impropriety of meddling as a Church with slavery. 5. "To promote the interests of our Zion in these Confederate States."

It will thus be seen that the General Synod seeks to plant herself squarely on the confessional foundation occupied by Luther and Melancthon when the Church was called into being by the reading of the Augsburg Confession, June 25, 1530. But while striving to maintain purity of doctrine and the orderly administration of the sacraments, and being duly conscious of her own identity, she nevertheless makes fraternal recognition of other evangelical Christians in the matter of preaching the Gospel and in the common participation of the eucharist.

THE GENERAL COUNCIL.

This body began its organization at Reading, Pa., in 1866, and completed it at Fort Wayne, Ind., in 1867, with eleven synods in full membership. Its strength at that time was 538 ministers, 1,030 congregations, 133,296 communicants. Since that time several synods have withdrawn and two have been added. At present the General Council is composed of nine synods in organic connection, and of two others which enjoy the privilege of debate, but are unwilling to unite. The Rev. John Nicum, secretary of the body, furnishes for this article the following statistics of the General Council, including the two synods in anomalous relation: 1,055 ministers, 1,907 congregations, 285,261 communicants, with 530 parochial schools and 25,000 pupils; \$30,444 59 for Home Missions, with 114 missionary pastors; \$18,162 22 for Foreign Missions, with five foreign missionaries, two native pastors, and 1,900 baptized Christians in India; \$16,228 for Emigrant Mission; \$17,891 62 for Church Extension; \$58,232 15 for Beneficiary Education, nearly all of which was expended in educating young men for the ministry. The confessional basis of the General Council is as follows:

We accept and acknowledge the doctrines of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession in its original sense, as throughout in conformity with the pure truth of which God's word is the only rule. We accept its statements of truth as in perfect accordance with the canonical Scriptures. We reject the errors it condemns, and we believe that all which it commits to the liberty of the Church of right belongs to that liberty.

In thus formally accepting and acknowledging the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, we declare our conviction that the other Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, inasmuch as they set forth none other than its system of doctrine and arti-

cles of faith, are of necessity pure and scriptural. Pre-eminent among such accordant, pure, and scriptural statements of doctrine, by their intrinsic excellence, by the great and necessary ends for which they were prepared, by their historical position, and the general judgment of the Church, are these: The Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Schmalcald Articles, the Catechisms of Luther, and the Formula of Concord, all of which are with the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, in the perfect harmony of one and the same scriptural faith.*

In subscribing the Book of Concord as her doctrinal basis the General Council uses the following language: "That Confessions may be such a testimony of unity and bonds of union, they must be accepted in every statement of doctrine in their own true, native, original, and only sense. Those who set them forth and subscribe them must not only agree to use the same words, but must use and understand those words in one and the same sense;" and because the General Council feels convinced that her doctrinal basis is "of necessity pure and scriptural," and therefore that all who deviate from that basis are so far in error; and because she believes it to be her duty not only to confess the truth, but to protest against error, she has promulgated "THE RULE: Lutheran pulpits are for Lutheran ministers only. Lutheran altars are for Lutheran communicants only." "*The exceptions* to the rule belong to the sphere of *privilege*, not of *right*." It is proper, however, to say that as a matter of fact, especially with the English-speaking portion of the General Council, the "*exceptions*" to the "Rule" are of frequent occurrence.

THE SYNODICAL CONFERENCE, OR "MISSOURIANS."

In the year 1838 a colony of seven hundred Lutherans from Germany, with six ministers and four candidates, settled

* The symbolical writings above mentioned, together with the three Ecumenical Creeds, were first published in one volume in 1580, and are styled in German *Die Symbolische Bücher*; in Latin, *Libri Symbolici* (often simply *Concordia*); in English, *The Book of Concord*; or, *The Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*. The Lutheran Church gives the first place to the Ecumenical Creeds, and thereby identifies herself with the Church Catholic of all ages. The other symbolical writings contained in the Book of Concord are *distinguishing*, that is, they distinguish the Lutheran Church from other Protestant Churches. The book as a whole has had such general (though not universal) official recognition in the Church that its statements must be regarded as decisive of what constitutes the historical Lutheran faith.

in Perry County, Mo. They were soon joined by others, and were variously assisted from the fatherland. In 1847 fifteen ministers and twelve congregations organized their first synod in Chicago, Ill. They are now scattered over a large portion of the United States, but are most familiarly known among Lutherans as "The Missourians." Their missionary zeal and educational activity mark them as worthy of all honor, and the results they achieve, considering their limited financial resources, are the marvel of all who observe them. From a handful, and all poor, in a little more than one generation they have grown into a body that now numbers 1,094 ministers, 2,006 congregations, 297,631 communicants, with eight colleges and three theological seminaries, all ably manned and well supplied with students. Rev. Henry Walker, an expert statistician among them, furnishes the following items for this article: 637 parochial school-teachers, nearly all of whom are graduates of the Teachers' College at Addison, Ill., and who make teaching their life-work, with 64,823 pupils in parochial schools; 100 missionaries, six of whom labor among the Negroes of the South, and one among the Jews of New York; \$60,000 expended on Home Missions during the two years ending with June, 1885. "They also publish thirteen papers and periodicals, support ten orphans' homes and eleemosynary institutions, and are building about seventy-five new churches annually." Their seminary at St. Louis cost \$200,000, has six professors, and 90 to 100 students every year.

The doctrinal basis of the Synodical Conference is:

The Synodical Conference acknowledges the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as God's word, and the Confession of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of 1580, called "the Concordia," as its own.

Following is the ordination vow of the Synodical Conference:

I confess the three ecumenical symbols of the Church, the Unaltered Augsburg Confession and its Apology, the Schmalcald Articles, the two Catechisms of Luther and the Form of Concord as a true, unadulterated explanation and statement of God's word and will; I confess these as my own confessions, and will, so long as I live, exercise my office faithfully and diligently according to them. So help me God by his Holy Spirit.

The Missourians, who use the German language almost exclusively in worship and in all the services of the sanctuary, have no pulpit-and-altar fellowship with other Christians.

THE UNITED SYNOD OF THE SOUTH.

The General Synod of the South, which was organized during the war, was dissolved June 28, 1886, and immediately merged into "The United Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the South," which had been organized two days previous, and contains 180 ministers, 360 congregations, and 29,683 communicants. No report of home or foreign missionary work has yet been made.

The confessional basis of the United Synod of the South is substantially identical with that of the General Council, inasmuch as it accepts the word of God as the rule of faith, and all the symbolical books as "in the perfect harmony of one and the same pure, scriptural faith."

THE INDEPENDENT SYNODS.

There are in this country twelve independent Lutheran synods, which, with a few independent pastors and churches, number 813 ministers, 1,923 congregations, and 206,120 communicants. All these are more or less active in missionary, educational, and eleemosynary work, but no reliable statistics have been furnished on these items apart from the general summaries given below. All these independent synods are characterized by strict confessional tendency, but it would be difficult to state wherein they differ one from another.

GENERAL SUMMARIES

of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States: Ministers, 4,052; congregations, 7,645; communicants, 955,683. There are 19 theological seminaries, with 55 professors, 653 students, and 50,395 volumes in their libraries; 26 colleges, with 177 professors and teachers, 2,627 students, and 104,800 volumes in their libraries; 27 classical academies, with 2,108 students; 47 eleemosynary institutions cared for 34,686 persons from September, 1885, to September, 1886, and from their founding (most of them within the last eight years) to the present time they have cared for 136,699 persons (25 not report-

ing this item). There are 134 periodicals, conducted in seven languages, only 42 being in English, as that language, indeed, represents less than one third of the Lutherans in this country. But there is harmony so far between those who use the English language that the General Synod, the General Council, and the United Synod of the South are at this time engaged in the joint preparation of a common liturgy according to the models of the sixteenth century, to be used by all three bodies as the authorized liturgy of each. This may be the harbinger of union; yet it must be added that even the most sanguine and hopeful cannot now see any very encouraging signs of a union near at hand, although no doctrinal controversy rages at this time as between any of the general bodies.

REMARKS.

1. Each of the general bodies of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States (and the same may be said of all the independent synods) stands squarely on the inspired word of God as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and on the Augsburg Confession of 1530 as a correct exhibition of the principal doctrines of the rule; that is, the Lutheran Church is thoroughly conservative, and stands committed against Romanism, Rationalism, and the "New Theology."

2. Three of the general bodies accept as confessional basis the entire volume* of symbolical writings, and two of them are very precise and exacting in their terms of subscription.

3. True to her historical antecedents, the Lutheran Church in this country is paying great attention to education, though it is proper to add that as yet her institutions of learning are but feebly endowed—owing largely to the comparative poverty of her people, the majority of whom have not been long enough in this country to accumulate beyond the current needs of the congregation and the steady demands for missions and beneficiary education.

4. Her missionary activity (which is not represented by

* It has been objected sometimes that the Lutheran symbols are too numerous (seven in all) and too voluminous. They are few in number and small in volume as compared with the Reformed creeds; and, notwithstanding her divisions, there is more real confessional harmony in the Lutheran Church than there is in the Reformed Church, which stands over against her as the other part of [original] Protestantism.

large sums of money) is confined mainly to the work at home. This arises from the fact that she feels bound to take care of and supply the bread of life to her own children, whom Providence is landing on these shores by thousands every year.

5. She makes ample provision (perhaps more than any other Protestant Church in America) for the orphan, the blind, the aged, the needy of her own communion, expending very large sums of money annually in the erection and support of eleemosynary institutions.

DISTINCTIVE DOCTRINES.*

This article would be wholly incomplete, and would fail utterly to accomplish its end, did it not contain a comprehensive statement of the leading doctrines by which the Evangelical Lutheran Church establishes her identity and justifies her separate ecclesiastical existence.

THE CAUSE OF REDEMPTION.

Here the Lutheran system stands in sharp contrast with the Calvinistic, which bases salvation on the decrees of God, who seeks thereby to manifest his perfections; that is, makes himself the ultimate object of his decree.† In the Lutheran sys-

* Two reasons may be given why the doctrines of the Lutheran Church have not been better understood in this country: 1. Until recently the scarcity of distinctive Lutheran literature in English, the Symbolical Books even being in German and Latin. 2. Writers on Lutheran doctrines have generally taken their materials at second hand from the polemical discussions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The Augsburg Confession, Luther's Small Catechism, and the Form of Concord are in Dr. Schaff's *Creeeds of Christendom*.

† "In the relation of God to man Calvinism presents the idea of the divine sovereignty as the principle of the system, all from God in an analytic method. This is the fundamental characteristic which is carried out in predestination and reprobation."—*Introduction to Christian Theology*, p. 64, by Prof. Henry B. Smith. "The Supralapsarians maintain that God, in forming his decree, first consulted the manifestation of his justice and mercy in saving some and condemning others of the human race; that all his decrees were designed to promote this end, and are to be regarded as means to its accomplishment; and that the last of these means was the gift of his Son as Redeemer to some, that is, to the elect, all the others being absolutely destined to destruction, and therefore reprobate. But, in order that man might be in a condition to illustrate the mercy and justice of God in his salvation or in his final ruin, in other words, in order that his decree to manifest these perfections might thus take effect, they say that God decreed that he should

tem salvation has its cause in the goodness and love of God, and for its end the beatification of man ; that is, God had compassion on fallen man, and seeks to save him from his lost and ruined condition.

The prime cause of our salvation is the immense pity and grace of God, which in this place is not considered as an attribute or essential quality of God (that belongs to *theologia* proper), but in the matter of our salvation as the prime and supreme cause, the fountain, the source of all those things which have reference to the procuring of our salvation.*

The internal impelling cause is the goodness of God, especially if you consider the blessedness to be conferred on the sinner. That benignant favor of God toward sinners by which he is moved to procure their salvation is called *the mercy, the love, the goodness of God*.†

This fundamental distinction runs through and through the two systems, the one making every thing center in God, or, rather, deducing the whole system from God's decree to manifest his justice and mercy through the decreed fall and ruin of man ; the other treats every separate topic from the stand-point of man's condition and needs : the one views Christ even as a "means" for executing the primary decree ; the other looks upon Christ as the pledge and proof of the great love where-with God loved us : the one regards the sacraments as signs and seals of a redemption already accomplished in and for the individual ; the other holds the sacraments to be efficacious means of grace through which the Holy Spirit gives the power to believe, and bestows upon the individual the merit and righteousness of Christ.

SIN.

In opposition to the Pelagian, the semi-Pelagian, and the low Arminian, but in harmony with the Calvinist, the Lutheran system emphasizes the *total depravity* of man ; by which is meant "that original sin is not a superficial, but so deep a corruption of human nature that nothing sound or uncorrupt fall, and that by the fall he should become miserable ; and that in order to bring this about he decreed to call him into being, so that his creation might prepare the way for his fall, and his creation and fall afford an opportunity for the manifestation of his mercy in saving some, and of his justice in condemning others of his posterity."—*System of Theology*, Venema, p. 308.

* Quenstedt, *System of Theology*.

† Baier's *Compend*.

remains in the body or soul of man, his internal and external powers; according to one of the hymns of the Church:

“ ‘ This human frame, this soul, this all,
Is all corrupt through Adam's fall.’ ” *

The standard definition of original sin is: The want of original righteousness; that is, the loss of light in the mind, the aversion of the will from God, hardness of heart. This total depravity is hereditary, that is, entailed by inheriting the corrupt nature of Adam. The Confession says: †

Since the fall of Adam all men who are naturally engendered are conceived and born in sin; that is, they are all from their mother's womb full of evil desires and propensities, and can have by nature no true fear of God, no true faith in God; and that this innate disease or original sin is truly sin, which brings all those under the eternal wrath of God who are not born again by baptism and the Holy Spirit. . . . Evil lust and the want of original righteousness are sin and punishment. This hereditary evil is guilt, inasmuch that all men, in consequence of the disobedience of Adam, are subject to the displeasure of God. ‡

The Lutheran Church takes very little account of the theory of immediate imputation. Melancthon, after giving and fortifying his definition of original sin, as the want of original righteousness, says: “If any one wishes to add imputation, I make no objection.” Hence the guilt of original sin, or *reatus*, arises not primarily from man's federal relation to God, but from his natural relation, or rather from his present depraved condition in consequence of his descent from a depraved head whose nature he has inherited. And when the Confession says that this original sin belongs to all men “who are naturally engendered” it means to except Christ, “who was conceived of the Holy Ghost.”

PREDESTINATION AND ELECTION.

Here the Lutheran system comes into sharpest antithesis with the Calvinistic. Gerhard, the greatest of post-Reformation Lutheran theologians, says:

To this doctrine (the absolute decree) we oppose the gracious will of God, by which he seriously seeks the conversion and sal-

* Form of Concord, Epitome.

† Augsburg Confession, Art. II.

‡ Apology and Form of Concord.

vation of all, which gracious will the Scripture attests with *words*; Christ, with *tears*; God himself, with an *oath*." *

Predestination and election have no place in the earlier Lutheran Confessions, as they were not a subject of controversy with the Romanists and not a matter of dispute as between the Lutheran theologians themselves. Hence when they discuss the subject of God's foreknowledge and election in Article XI of the Form of Concord (1580), it is wholly with reference to the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination and election, the opposition to which reached its climax in the Saxon Visitation Articles of 1592, in which it is said:

That Christ died for all men, and, as the Lamb of God, took away the sins of the whole world. . . . That God created no man for condemnation.

The Lutheran creed, the Form of Concord, distinguishes between the *Præscientia* and the *Prædestinatio* of God. The former "pertains alike to the good and to the evil, but is not the cause of sin, . . . nor is it the cause of the destruction of man. But predestination, or the eternal election of God, pertains to the good and beloved children of God alone, and is the cause of their salvation." †

The Lutheran view may be summed up in these two propositions: Salvation is due solely to the *mercy* of God; damnation, solely to the *guilt* of man. But the Lutheran does not hold that his teaching on this profound and mysterious subject is necessarily free from difficulties. He accepts what he finds

* There can be no doubt but that in early life both Luther and Melancthon entertained Augustinian views of absolute predestination, as is evinced in the Reply to Erasmus on the Will, and in the first edition of the *Loci* (1521); but absolute predestination being fundamentally at variance with Luther's view of the love of God and of the cause of salvation, it could not and did not form the center of the system. Both Luther and Melancthon gradually let it slide into the background, and in the later editions of the *Loci* not only does Melancthon abandon it, but he proclaims the universality of the promise of grace, and declares that "the cause of election is mercy in the will of God." September 30, 1530, he wrote to Brentz: "In the entire Apology I avoided that long and inexplicable dispute about predestination. Every-where I speak as if predestination follows faith and works. And I do this with a distinct purpose; I do not wish to disturb consciences by these inexplicable labyrinths."

† Reprobation finds no place either in the creeds or in the theology of the Lutheran Church—it is utterly rejected as "false, odious, and blasphemous." In the Calvinistic system "the other special name given to predestination is *reprobation*."—*Venema*, p. 297.

plainly revealed in God's word, and gives himself but little concern with the alleged logical inconsistencies. "Avoiding all refined, curious, and useless speculations and questions," he declares that "this predestination of God is not to be sought out in God's secret counsel, but in the word of God, in which it is revealed."*

FREE-WILL.

With the Calvinist, but historically before him, the Lutheran Church recognizes the absolute sovereignty of God; with the Arminian, but likewise historically before him, she recognizes the freedom of the human will. To reconcile these antinomies she makes no attempt. She accepts both as ultimate facts—the one as revealed in the infallible word, the other as given in consciousness. Her doctrine of the will is not that it is not metaphysically free, but that it is *impotent* in consequence of a darkened understanding and of a corrupt heart, as the result of sin. Man can do works of civil righteousness, but he cannot do the will of God, because he does not know the will of God and does not have the love of God in his heart. This also is sin. In consequence of this moral and spiritual inability man can neither originate, nor of his own power carry forward, any work pertaining to his salvation. As pertaining to God, he can originate and carry forward only that which is evil.† Nor can he co-operate with God by reason of his natural powers and gifts. All this is confessionally stated as follows:

Concerning free-will it is taught that, to some extent, man has freedom of will to lead a life outwardly honest, and to choose between things which reason comprehends. . . . We acknowledge that in all men there is free-will, for they all, indeed, have natural

* Form of Concord, Art. XI. This unquestionably was the position of Luther and Melancthon long before the doctrine found confessional statement in the Form of Concord. Melancthon wrote in the *Loci*: "We must form our judgment of election not from reason and the law, but from the Gospel." And Luther, while not formally abandoning the views expressed against Erasmus in 1525, and even admitting that there is for us a contradiction between the secret and revealed will of God (see Köstlin, *Luther's Theologie*, ii, p. 328), nevertheless maintained that God calls all to repentance and salvation, and says: "God must be looked at as he has revealed himself."

† Luther (Com. in Gen. chap. vi, 5), 1544, declared as the "final sentiment and conclusion on Free-will . . . that man without the Holy Spirit is evil, that whatever he does without the Holy Spirit or faith is condemned before God, because man's heart and thoughts are depraved."

connate understanding and reason; not that they are able to act in things pertaining to God, such as to love and fear God from the heart, but only in external works of this life have they freedom to choose good and evil.*

When the Holy Spirit has commenced this work of regeneration and renewal in us, through the word and the holy sacraments, then assuredly we can and should co-operate through the power of the Holy Ghost, although still in great weakness. But this co-operation results, not from our natural and carnal powers, but from the new powers and gifts which the Holy Spirit originated in us in conversion. The new birth, the inward change of heart, mind, and disposition, are works of the Holy Spirit alone.†

All this is in sharp contrast with Pelagianism, and with every form of synergism which would attribute any of the glory of our salvation to the operation or to the co-operation of the natural ability of man; it is equally opposed to the theory of necessity, for it recognizes man's responsibility for his moral conduct and for his attitude toward the operations of the Holy Ghost through the means of grace. The whole is comprehensively summed up by Melancthon in the Apology :

Admitting that we are capable of performing external works, we still affirm that the free-will and reason of man have no ability *in spiritual things*; that is, truly to believe in God and confidently to trust that he is near us, that he hears us, forgives our sin, etc.

SOTERIOLOGY.

The soteriology of a Church may be inferred from her view of the person and work of Christ. Here the Evangelical Lutheran Church, both in the re-affirmation of the ecumenical creeds and in the clear and emphatic testimony of her own peculiar symbols, maintains the perfect deity and the perfect humanity of Christ—true God begotten of the Father from eternity, and also true man born of the Virgin Mary—in personal union subsisting, and constituting the one Theanthropos, whose two natures, the divine and the human, are forever and inseparably conjoined, so that wherever the one is there of necessity the other must be.‡

* Augsburg Confession, Art. XVIII.

† Form of Concord.

‡ It has been charged that the Lutheran doctrine of the person of Christ, especially the omnipresence of the human nature of Christ by virtue of the personal union with the divine, was invented to sustain the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence. The fact is, that the doctrines of the Real Presence and of the person of Christ had received both confessional and dogmatic statement in the

It is taught, likewise, that God the Son became man, and was born of the blessed Virgin Mary; and that the two natures, human and divine, inseparably united in one person, are one Christ, who is true God and man, who was really born, who truly suffered, was crucified, died, and was buried, that he might be a sacrifice, not only for original sin, but also for all other sins, and might appease the wrath of God.*

But no Lutheran creed contains a theory of the atonement, although the whole Lutheran system magnifies the blood of Christ, and has always combated Socinianism.

As a result of the personal union, the Lutheran theology, both confessional and dogmatic, strictly maintains the *communicatio idiomatum*, of which there are three kinds: First, "The communication of attributes; that in which the properties of the natures are ascribed to the whole person. Thus it is said: God suffered, the Son of God was born of a woman, the Son of Mary was before Abraham, Christ created all things." † Second, "That in which, on account of the personal union, divine majesty, honor, and power are ascribed to the human nature—*omnipotence, omniscience, power to give life, power to forgive sin and execute judgment, the honor of worship, omnipresence*—all of which have been given to Christ according to his human nature, as according to his divine nature he possesses all things." ‡ Third, "That in which the works of his office are ascribed to Christ, not according to one nature only, but according to both natures. Thus Christ is called our Mediator, Prophet, High-priest, Redeemer, Saviour, King, Lord, etc.;" by which it is meant that "each nature in Christ performs what is *proper* to itself in *communion* with the other." §

The whole idea is, that Christ redeems us and performs all the works of his office according to both the divine and human natures. He must be true man in order that he may truly suffer and die. He must be true God in order to bear the sins of the whole world, to sustain the wrath of God, to satisfy divine justice, to overcome death, hell, and the devil, and to merit everlasting righteousness for his people.

Lutheran Church long before Chemnitz wrote his great work, *The Two Natures of Christ*, in which he simply developed and gave scientific statement and form to the Chalcedonic Symbol of 451.

* Augsburg Confession, Art. III.

† Dietrich, *ut supra*.

‡ Dietrich's Catechism, 1613.

§ *Ibid.*

JUSTIFICATION.

Justification is that forensic act by which God the judge pronounces *just* the sinner who believes in Christ. Its impelling cause is the goodness of God; its meritorious cause is the active and passive obedience of Christ; its instrumental cause is faith, which is trust, confidence, *fiducia*. Justification is more than pardon; it is pardon together with the imputation of Christ's righteousness, and is always followed by good works, which cannot exist prior to faith and love.

As the *material principle* of redemption, out of which arises personal assurance, and conscious experience of salvation, the Lutheran Church has always grasped this article as her own peculiar treasure, by which she is relatively distinguished from the Reformed, who have always insisted more energetically on the *formal principle*, that is, the sole authority of the Holy Scriptures. Luther called it the article of a standing or falling Church:

The chief Corner-stone, which alone begets, nourishes, edifies, preserves, defends the Church of God; as without it the Church of God could not subsist a single hour.*

SACRAMENTS.

In common with other Protestant Churches, and in opposition to Rome, the Lutheran Church maintains two sacraments—Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Her view of the use of the sacraments is set forth in Article XIII of the Augsburg Confession:

Concerning the use of the sacraments it is taught, that the sacraments have been instituted, not only as tokens by which Christians may be known externally, but as signs and evidences of the divine will toward us, for the purpose of exciting and strengthening our faith; hence they also require faith, and they are properly used then only when received in faith, and when faith is strengthened by them.

In the former part of this article the confessors opposed Zwingli, whose views had been clearly ascertained the year before at Marburg, and who, in his *Ratio Fidei*, sent to Augsburg (1530), declared: "I believe, yea, I know, that all the sacraments are so far from conferring grace that they do not

* *Briefe*, de Wette, P. IV, p. 150.

even convey or distribute it." It has always been the doctrine of the Lutheran Church that the sacraments are "efficacious signs and sure testimonies of God's grace and purposes toward us, by which he admonishes and strengthens our hearts to believe the more firmly and joyfully.*" The latter part of the article opposes "the pernicious, shameful, and impious doctrine of the *opus operatum*, namely, that the mere use of the sacraments, the work performed, makes us just before God, and secures his grace, even without a good disposition of the heart." †

Hence, in studying the Lutheran doctrine of the sacraments, these two points must ever be kept in full view as fundamental; namely, First, that the sacraments are efficacious means of grace; secondly, that they require faith in order to their efficacy.

The proper use of the sacraments requires faith to believe the divine promises, and receive the promised grace, which is offered through the sacraments and the word. ‡

BAPTISM.

Article IX of the Confession contains the fundamental symbolical statement of the Lutheran Church on baptism. As literally translated it is as follows:

Respecting baptism it is taught that it is necessary; that grace is offered through it; and that children ought to be baptized, who through such baptism are presented to God, and become acceptable to him. Therefore the Anabaptists are condemned, who teach that infant baptism is improper.

Analyzing this article we find four principal propositions:

1. *Baptism is necessary.*—No Lutheran confession, and no Lutheran theologian from Luther and Melancthon down to those of the present day, has ever claimed or taught that the necessity of baptism is *absolute* in the sense that it binds God, or is indispensable to salvation. The aphorism of Augustine, "not the privation of a sacrament, but the contempt of it, condemns," is a *locus classicus* in the Lutheran Church. Carpzov, the greatest commentator on the Augsburg Confession, voices in the following explanation the uniform sentiment of all the

* Apology.

† *Ibid.*

‡ *Ibid.*

Lutheran teachers. Quoting from the Latin copy *necessarius ad salutem*, he adds:

1.) *Not absolutely*, but 2.) *by the necessity of command*, and because Christ so appoints ordinarily to save man; and 3.) *by the necessity of means*, because it has pleased him to use this means in the application of the salvation procured by himself.*

2. *That grace is offered through it.*—This is exactly in harmony with the Lutheran view that a sacrament is a means of grace, not *ex opere operato*, but requiring faith in order to its efficacy. But it does not teach, and was never intended to teach, "baptismal regeneration" (a phrase which is not found in any Lutheran creed) in the sense, *baptized, therefore regenerated*; but it does teach *taufgnade*, or grace bestowed in and through baptism, by which the Holy Ghost may work regeneration, and will work it where baptism is not hindered by unbelief. In the case of adults faith alone makes a person worthy to receive baptism. Hence to such, who have believed through the word, baptism becomes a seal and a confirmation of faith.

3. *That infants ought to be baptized.*—This was written in opposition to the Anabaptists, "who teach that infant baptism is improper."

4. *That by baptism infants are presented to God and become acceptable.*—In the Larger Catechism Luther declares his belief that God has given the Holy Spirit to many baptized in infancy.† He says:

We bring forward the child under the impression and hope that it believes, and we pray God to give it faith; but we do not

* "The Reformed Church teaches that baptism is a duty. If a man wishes to be and to be regarded as a disciple of Christ, he is bound to be baptized. If he wishes to consecrate his children to God, he is bound to do it in the way of His appointment. This is plain—1) From the command of Christ. 2) From the conduct of the apostles. . . . The Reformed Church teaches that baptism is a means of grace."—Dr. Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol. iii, pp. 588, 590.

† Dr. Hodge, speaking of the baptism of infants, says: "What is to hinder the imputation to them of the righteousness of Christ, and their receiving the renewal of the Holy Ghost, so that their whole nature may be developed in a state of reconciliation with God? Doubtless this often occurs."—*Systematic Theology*, vol. iii, p. 590. John Wesley, as quoted by Pope, says: "It is certain our Church [that is, the Church of England] supposes that all who are baptized in their infancy are at the same time born again." [But Wesley does not affirm this for himself, nor is it the doctrine of his followers.—Ed.] "What time in infancy is more likely to be the period of spiritual quickening than the moment when that

baptize it on that account, but rather because God has commanded us so to do.

That by the washing of water in the word Christ by his Spirit is efficacious in infants who are baptized, so that they receive the gift of God, is not to be doubted; but in what manner this takes place we do not understand.*

Hence it is the uniform teaching of the Lutheran dogmatical writers that baptism is the ordinary means for the regeneration of the children of believers. Thus Boerner in his commentary on the Lutheran Symbols:

Baptism is the ordinary means by which children are made partakers of the benefits of the kingdom of heaven, and therefore it has the necessity of means. For by baptism, regeneration and what follows, namely, justification, sanctification, and eternal salvation, are, in accordance with the gracious will of God, conferred on children. . . . Baptism is not absolutely necessary to salvation, so that those who by no fault of their own are deprived of it are condemned; but the necessity presupposes the possibility of it. Infants who are cut off from baptism by death, and consequently die unbaptized, are by no means lost. Those who without any fault of their own cannot be made partakers of this ordinary means of grace are without doubt regenerated and saved by the extraordinary grace of God.

Luther and Bugenhagen condemn those who deny to unbaptized children the rites of Christian burial, and say: "We bury them as Christians, confessing thereby that we believe the strong assurances of Christ. The bodies of these unbaptized children have part in the joyous resurrection of life."

In regard to the infants of unbelievers, we are either to suspend our judgment or adopt the milder opinion, in view of the universality of the salvation of Christ, which can be applied to them by some extraordinary mode of regeneration.†

sacred rite is performed which is strikingly emblematic of this change? Whether it be proper to say that baptism may be the *means* of regeneration, depends on the sense in which the word *means* is used. If in the sense of presenting motives to the rational mind, as when the word is read or heard, then it is not a *means*; for the child has no knowledge of what is done for it. But, if by *means* be understood something which is accompanied by the divine efficiency, changing the moral nature of the infant, then, in this sense, baptism may be called the means of regeneration when thus accompanied by divine grace."—*Religious Experience*, by A. Alexander, D.D.

* Chemnitz, *Loci Theol. De Baptismo*.

† Fauerlin on Augsburg Confession, p. 10.

It is worthy of notice that the late Prof. Henry B. Smith held the following language in regard to infant salvation: "As to those who die in infancy, there is

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper is comprehensively set forth in the tenth article of the Augsburg Confession :

Concerning the holy Supper of the Lord, it is taught that the true body and blood of Christ are truly present, under the form of bread and wine, in the Lord's Supper, and are there administered and received. The opposite doctrine is therefore rejected.*

This is the doctrine of the real presence, and is intended to teach that wherever and whenever the sacramental act is performed—*blessing, distribution, eating and drinking*—there and then, in, with, and under the external elements of bread and wine, Christ the God-man, true God and true man, is veritably present, and is administered to and received by the communicant, whether he be worthy or unworthy.

The Lutheran doctrine is thus antithetical 1) to the Romish transubstantiation, which both before and ever since 1530 the Lutherans have rejected in name and in reality. The doctrine affirms the presence of true natural bread and wine, which in the Lutheran theology are called the earthly element of the sacrament ; 2) to the Zwinglian view, in that it affirms the true objective presence of the whole Christ, not merely of the divine nature of Christ, for, according to the Lutheran doctrine of the person of Christ, wherever the divine nature of Christ is, there of necessity the human nature of Christ must be. This, namely, the body and blood of Christ, which was born of the Virgin Mary, received into the person of the Son of God, and was given unto death for us, is called the heavenly element.

The presence of Christ in the eucharist is called a *true*, a *real*

a well-grounded hope that they are of the elect."—*System of Christian Theology*, p. 322. And Arminius: "I affirm that they rejected the grace of the Gospel in their parents, grandparents, great-grandparents, etc., by which act they deserved to be abandoned of God."—*Works*, lii, 368, ed. of 1853. Thus Arminius admits at least the [*formal not real*] possibility of the damnation of infants, and Prof. Smith has only a "well-grounded hope" of their salvation, based on the "hope and belief" that all who die in infancy are elect, p. 318 ; whereas many of the older Calvinists speak of the "reprobation of infants;" for instance, Musculus, Martyr, Chamier, and the Swiss theologians at Dort.

* When the Confession says "form of bread and wine," it does not mean the *form* without the substance, but, as Melancthon says, "The visible things ; to wit, bread and wine." [*Two essences consubstantiated.*—EDITOR.]

presence, to distinguish it from a merely representative or figurative presence; it is called *substantial* presence, to distinguish it from the merely efficacious presence of the body and blood of Christ; it is called the *mysterious, supernatural, incomprehensible* presence, because it is not according to any mode of this world; but mysteriously, supernaturally, incomprehensibly, the body and blood of Christ are present in the Holy Supper and are distributed to the communicants.

What the Lutherans principally contend for is, 1) the reality of the presence in the eucharist of the whole Christ as against the Zwinglians, special mention being made of the body and blood because they especially were the subject of dispute; 2) the reality of the bread and wine as against transubstantiation, which maintains only the semblance of bread and wine. Hence, when in the sacramental act the bread and body, the wine and blood are brought together, neither enters on a new form or mode of being, neither is swallowed up by the other, neither is changed or converted into the other. Hence CONSUBSTANTIATION, as that word has been used and understood for three hundred years, and as it is defined by Hooker, Buck's Theological Dictionary, Schaff-Herzog, and other non-Lutheran authorities, does not and cannot represent the Lutheran doctrine of the real presence; and hence both that word and every other word which attempts to *define* or *describe* the nature or the *mode* of that presence, or the nature or the mode of the sacramental union; or which involves any change in the earthly element of the sacrament; or implies the existence of union aside from the sacramental use, is now, and without a single exception has always been, rejected by the Lutheran theologians.*

The design of the Lord's Supper is thus stated by Melancthon in the Apology:

* Is it not remarkable that the whole Protestant Church except the Lutherans should, for three hundred years, with the whole case laid open before them, have entertained the same mistake, and that the Lutherans themselves, in their exposition of the subject, should seem to all but themselves to concede by necessary implication what they formally deny? Lutherans say that the two substances, the body and blood of Christ, and the bread and wine, stand together in the sacrament, and that fact seems, to all but themselves, to be not infelicitously expressed by the Latinized noun, CONSUBSTANTIATION. It is, as to all appearances, the same *rose*, though called by another name. Why then should that name be offensive?—EDITOR.

The sacrament was instituted by Christ to console the alarmed conscience, to strengthen our faith when we believe that the flesh of Christ was given for the life of the world, and that by this nourishment we are united with Christ and obtain grace and life.—Art. X.

CATHOLICITY.

While the Evangelical Lutheran Church believes that she holds in their purity all the catholic doctrines of the Church of Christ, yet she does not affirm that she is the one only Church. The Augsburg Confession, Article VII, defines the Church as "the congregation of all believers, among whom the Gospel is preached in its purity, and the holy sacraments are administered according to the Gospel."* The Apology says:

We affirm and know of a truth that there are children of God scattered throughout all the world.

And Dr. Carpzov, a zealous Lutheran theologian, affirms:

No particular Church can boast itself that it is The Church; for it is one thing to be The Church and another thing to be *of* The Church. . . . We admit that our Church is a particular Church, but that she is the only true Church we do not say.

This article, having already transcended the generous limits prescribed by the editor of the periodical in which it appears, is now brought to a close without reflections or deductions. The reader has the facts, and can make his own reflections. The writer has striven to the best of his ability to act the part of the historian, and not that of the apologist or of the panegyrist. If he has spoken tenderly of the Lutheran Church, it is because she is his mother; if feebly, it is because of his own weakness. What he desires to say of himself is best expressed in the words of another: "If I have done well, and as is fitting the story, it is that which I desired; but if slenderly and meanly, it is that which I could attain unto."

* Under this second sign of a true churchly character, since all other administrations but its own may be adjudged to be not according to the Gospel, it is quite possible that the Lutheran Church shall be as uncatholic and exclusive as is the Anglican or the Roman Church, and such, it is well known, it often is in fact.—EDITOR.

ART. V.—OLD TESTAMENT REVISION.

THE first and most important pre-requisite for the translator of an ancient document, if he does not possess the autograph, is to ascertain the best text of that document. If he has but a single copy of the document, his textual criticism lies within a very small compass, and must be confined to the consideration of possible interpolations and to the suggestion of emendations of the text depending upon his subjective judgment, and is likely to be very unsatisfactory.

For the translators of the books of the Old Testament, the first thing to be determined is, *What text shall be adopted?* And this leads us to consider briefly the sources for settling the text of the Old Testament. And here, first of all, we must remark, what is well known, that not only have we no autographs * of the books of the Old Testament, but we have not even *copies* of the Hebrew Scriptures a thousand years old. The books of the Old Testament were written in Hebrew (some Chaldee portions excepted) between B. C. 1452 and about B. C. 400. About five hundred manuscripts of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament were collected by Kennicott in the last part of the last century; but the most ancient of these manuscripts were less than a thousand years old. The most celebrated manuscript of the Old Testament is that which takes its name from Rabbi Aaron ben Asher ben Moses, who lived at Tiberias in the *tenth* century. This manuscript is regarded both by the Karaïtes and the rabbies as a model Codex of the Hebrew Scriptures, and it is the one from which the common Masoretic text is printed.

But we have *versions* of the Old Testament far older than the oldest extant Hebrew MS. The *Five Books* of Moses were translated from the original Hebrew into Greek about B. C. 280; the other books were translated into the same language within the following century and a half. This is the version called the *Septuagint*. We have also the *Syriac Version* of the Old Testament, made from the original Hebrew, executed about A. D. 150. We have also the Chaldee translation of the *Pentateuch* made by Onkelos about A. D. 20,

* We have no autograph of the great classical writings of Greece and Rome.

if not earlier. About the same time, a translation of the Prophets was made into Chaldee by Jonathan ben Uzziel. Both of these translations, called Targums, are extant. Besides these we have the Samaritan copy of the Pentateuch, taken from the Hebrew not later than B. C. 330; and also an Aramean translation of the same made about the time of Christ. In the last part of the fourth century, the celebrated Christian scholar Jerome translated the Old Testament into Latin, which is also extant, and the great authority with the Church of Rome. A critical edition of the text of the Old Testament based on the oldest versions as well as on the oldest Hebrew manuscripts does not exist.

The revisers of the English version of the Old Testament have closely followed the Masoretic Hebrew text, though they sometimes refer to the readings of the ancient versions when they differ from the Hebrew. Thus on the margin of Gen. iv, 8, it is stated: "Many ancient authorities have, *said unto Abel his brother, Let us go into the field.*" These ancient authorities are the Samaritan Pentateuch, Septuagint, Peshito Syriac, and Latin Vulgate, which make it probable that the addition, "Let us go into the field," once belonged to the Hebrew text. On the margin of Gen. vi, 3, we have: "Or, according to many ancient versions, *abide in.*"

On the margin of Gen. xv, 2, it is stated: "The Chaldee and Syriac have, *Eliezer the Damascene.*" On the margin of Gen. xxii, 13, the revisers remark: "Or, according to many ancient authorities, *behold a ram caught.*" These authorities are the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Septuagint, the Targum of Onkelos, and the Peshito Syriac. On the margin of Gen. xxxii, 28, the revisers give the reading of the Septuagint and the Vulgate; and on the margin of Gen. xxxvi, 2, it is stated: "Some ancient authorities have, *son,*" and on the margin of verse 39, *Hadad* is given as the reading of some ancient authorities. Again, on the margin of Gen. xlvii, 21, the reading of the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Septuagint, and the Vulgate is given; and also on the margin of Gen. xlix, in several places ancient readings are referred to.

In a similar manner throughout the Old Testament the revisers refer to the different readings of the ancient versions, the last of which we find in Mal. ii, 3. The revisers, however, ex-

press no opinion respecting the value of these different readings, and the reader is left to form his own judgment upon the matter.

But to proceed to the revision itself. If our revisers possessed no remarkable advantages over the scholars who made King James's translation in the means of fixing the text of the Old Testament, they enjoyed far greater resources for giving us an exact translation of the Hebrew text. For the critical study of the Hebrew language and its sister dialects, Syriac, Chaldee, Ethiopic, and Arabic (to say nothing of Assyrian), has been prosecuted with the greatest zeal and success in the long interval since 1611, the date of King James's version. The present century, especially, has been distinguished by the publication of the great Hebrew lexicons of Gesenius and Fürst, and the Hebrew grammars of Ewald, Gesenius, Nordheimer, Green, Böttcher, and of the Hebrew tenses of Driver. Philology, which investigates the common laws of thought and the affinities of languages, is of modern growth. The dialects of the Shemitic family have been made to illustrate the Hebrew, their venerable sister, and to help her out of difficulties. To all these advantages, which a translator of the Old Testament now possesses, must be added our vastly increased knowledge of the geography, topography, the animals, plants, manners, and customs of Palestine and its contiguous lands, furnished within the last fifty years by numerous Oriental travelers and explorers. Besides all these advantages, our revisers had the assistance of the excellent German translation of the Bible made by the distinguished scholar Dr. De Wette, if they wished to avail themselves of it.

A translator of the Old Testament should have a critical knowledge of Hebrew and Chaldee, and a considerable acquaintance with Syriac and Arabic, and be familiar with the natural history of Palestine. He should, at the same time, possess a most thorough knowledge of all the idioms and niceties of the language into which the version is to be made. He should also have excellent taste and judgment, not too conservative, on the one hand, nor too fond of novelties on the other. The poetic faculty would likewise be of advantage to him. The excellency of a translation consists in its reproducing faithfully all the spirit and force of the original in the best and tersest idiomatic language.

In reference to our English translation, it was an unfortunate circumstance that the revisers were hampered by the rules laid down for their observance, and thus the revision has not attained all the excellence that could be desired. Among these rules was one requiring no change to be made in King James's version unless sanctioned by *two thirds* of all the revisers. It was *a priori* probable that most of the revisers would be *conservative*, and, therefore, a simple majority should have been sufficient to make a change. The American revisers, or rather *advisers*, like delegates from the Territories in Congress, had a right to *speak*, but not to *vote*. They were allowed the privilege of *publishing* their suggestions at the *end* of the translation.

After these preliminary reflections, we proceed to examine the work of our English revisers, beginning with natural phenomena; and first in order, the heavens. In 2 Kings xxiii, 5, occurs "planets," which should be "the twelve signs of the zodiac" (the Hebrew being *Mazzaloth*). Here the revisers have left the word in King James's translation unchanged. In Job xxxviii, 32, we have the same word, in nearly the same form, which our revisers have left untranslated: "Canst thou lead forth the mazzaroth in their season," that is, *the twelve signs of the zodiac*. It would have been better to insert "the signs of the zodiac" in the text instead of putting it on the margin. "The sweet influences of Pleiades," of the Authorized Version, is rightly changed to "The cluster of the Pleiades." "Arcturus and his sons," of King James's version, gives place to "the Bear and her train." This is well and poetically rendered, as the Hebrew *ash* is *wagon*, *Great Bear and her sons* (three stars in the tail of the *Bear*). In Job ix, 9, "Arcturus" is changed, and we have "the Bear, Orion, and the Pleiades." Respecting the heavenly bodies, King James's translation has: "There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard." The revised translation renders: "There is no speech nor language; their voice cannot be heard" (Psa. xix, 3), which gives the force of the Hebrew, with the exception that "cannot be" should be "is not."

Leaving the heavens, and descending to the earth, we come to the phrase "the parched ground," in the version of King James, "shall become a pool." (Isa. xxxv, 7.) The Revised

Version reads: "And the glowing sand shall become a pool," and "mirage," as an alternate translation, is put in the margin. The Hebrew is שָׁרָב, *sharab*, the *mirage* (Gesenius, *sandmeer*, *sand sea*). The Arabic is *serab*, *mirage*. Mohammed very beautifully refers to it in the Koran (chap. xxiv, 39): "The works of the unbeliever," says he, "are like the *mirage*, to which the thirsty traveler cometh, thinking it to be water, and he findeth it to be nothing." How beautiful and expressive, then, is the language of Isaiah: "The mirage shall become a lake," a glorious reality!

In Gen. xxxvi, 24, in the Authorized Version, it is said: "This was that Anah that found the mules in the wilderness." The Hebrew word rendered "mules" in this passage is יְמִיִּם, the *yēmîm*. The Septuagint leaves the word untranslated. It cannot mean *mules*; for פָּרֶדֶה, *peredh*, is the word for mules in the Old Testament. Jerome remarks: "Some think the word means 'hot springs,' from its resemblance to the Punic, which is closely allied to the Hebrew." The Peshito Syriac renders it *waters*. The Vulgate, *aquas calidas*, *hot waters*, or *hot springs*. Both Gesenius and Fürst favor the rendering *warm springs*. The word is closely allied to יוֹם, *yom*, day, so called from its *heat*. This explanation is in the highest degree probable, since we find the *hot springs* of Callirrhoe, *ten* in number, a few miles east of the Dead Sea, one of them, according to Merrill, having a temperature of 139° Fahrenheit, and may well be called *hot*. Our revisers, then, are fully justified in putting "*hot springs*" in the place of these mules.

In the Hebrew Bible occurs, in more than two hundred and sixty places, the word מִדְבָּר, *midhbar*, in most instances with the article. In almost every instance our revisers adhere to the Authorized Version, and translate it *wilderness*. Now, there are some passages where this rendering is certainly allowable. Gesenius defines the word: 1) *Pasture land, open fields*, an uninhabited tract or region. Several passages occur in this sense. 2) *A desert*, a sterile and solitary region. This definition manifestly suits most of the passages of the Old Testament. When at Suez, nearly seventeen years ago, my eyes first fell upon the great desolate tract extending from the Red Sea coast toward Palestine, the *great desert*, the word *wilderness* of the Authorized Version struck me at once as tame and

wholly unsuitable to express such a barren and lifeless tract. As examples in which the revisers follow the Authorized version, but where the full and accurate sense requires the word to be rendered *desert*, we give the following passages: "He turneth a *wilderness* into a pool of water, and a dry land into water springs." Here it is evident that *desert* should stand in the place of *wilderness*: "He turneth a *desert* into a pool of water." (Psa. cvii, 35.) Similar is Isa. xli, 18: "I will make the *wilderness* a pool of water, and the dry land springs of water." Manifestly in this passage *desert* should be inserted in the place of *wilderness*. Again, Hos. ii, 3: "And make her as a *wilderness*, and set her like a dry land." Here *desert* should be inserted in the place of *wilderness*. (Mal. i, 3.) "Gave his heritage to the jackals of the *wilderness*." In this instance, also, *desert* should take the place of *wilderness*, as jackals dwell in the *desert*. So Isa. xxxv, 1, should be the *desert*, or desolate place, instead of *wilderness*.

Respecting the *plants* of the Old Testament we may remark that the most of them occur in Solomon's Song. Our revisers have very properly *changed* the names of a few of them. In the Authorized Version the word *juniper* occurs four times: first in 1 Kings xix, 4, where it is said that "Elijah sat down under a juniper-tree;" also in verse 5 of the same chapter, where it is stated that he "lay and slept under a juniper." In Job xxx, 4, we have "juniper roots for their meat;" and in Psa. cxx, 4, "coals of juniper." The Hebrew word is *rothem*; Arabic, *retam*, broom. In 1 Kings xix, 4, 5, the revisers have retained juniper, but have put "or, broom," in the margin of verse 4. In Job xxx, 4, they have translated the word by "broom" without any remark; but in Psalm cxx, 4, they retain "juniper," but put in the margin "or, broom." Why the name of this well-known shrub should be so differently translated is hard to imagine. When in Palestine we saw, on the last day of December, 1869, several of these shrubs, about ten feet high, in a wady near the north end of the Dead Sea. They had limbs resembling Scotch broom. I asked my guide, a young sheikh, their name. He answered *retam*; the same as the Hebrew *rothem*. No traveler, so far as I know, has spoken of finding this shrub or tree in this region of Palestine.

In the Authorized Version, in Ecces. xii, 5, occurs the phrase, "And desire shall fail." Instead of this the revised edition has, "And the caper-berry shall fail." This rendering has been ridiculed, and it has been suggested that the revised translation of the Old Testament should be called *the Caper-berry version*. But our translators, in this matter, are in the right. The Hebrew word הַאֲבִיּוֹנָה, *ha'biyyonah*, is rendered caper-berry both by Gesenius and Fürst, and is the translation of the Septuagint, Peshito Syriac, and Vulgate. The noun has the article, which it would not be likely to have if it were an abstract noun. Besides, the two previous nouns are the names of material objects, the almond and the grasshopper. The caper-berry was said to excite lust, and the idea to be conveyed is, that all the passions of man fail in his old age, and cannot be aroused.

From plants we pass to animals. In the list of animals, clean and unclean, in the eleventh chapter of Leviticus, *thirty-two* in all, the names of about *fifteen* in the Authorized Version have been changed in the revised translation; and of the list of thirty-two in the fourteenth chapter of Deuteronomy, about *ten* have been changed in the revised translation. What animals are intended by these names is in many cases very uncertain. In eight places in the Authorized Version, namely, in Num. xxiii, 22; Deut. xxxiii, 17; Job xxxix, 9, 10; Psa. xcii, 10; xxii, 21; xxix, 6; Isa. xxxiv, 7, occurs the word *unicorn*. The Hebrew word רִאִים, רִים, or רִאִים, is regarded by Gesenius as the *wild buffalo*, an animal known in the regions of Palestine at the present day. Our revisers have in every instance substituted *wild ox** in the place of *unicorn*, and are to be commended for the change.

In the Authorized Version the Hebrew word לִיָּאָתָן, *liwyathan*, in the form *leviathan*, occurs five times. (Job xli, 1; Psa. lxxiv, 14; civ, 26, and twice in Isa. xxvii, 1.) In the Hebrew text it is also found in Job iii, 8, but rendered *mourning*, and leviathan is put in the margin as an alternate translation. In all these passages the revisers leave the word *leviathan* untranslated, remarking in the margin, in one instance, "That is, *the crocodile*." It would have been better to put *crocodile* in the text instead of *leviathan*; for there can be no doubt, from

* *Rénu*, wild ox, Assyrian the same as the Hebrew רִים, *rēm*. See *Proleg. Heb.-Aram. Wörterbuchs zum Alt. Tes.*, by F. Delitzsch, 1886.

the description of the animal, that it should be thus rendered. In Job xl, 15, occurs the word *behemoth* in the Hebrew text, which the revisers retain in their translation, remarking in the margin, "That is, *the hippopotamus*." No doubt this is the animal intended by the author of the book.

I come now to the quadruped that most especially interests me, but whose very existence as an animal of sacred Scripture until recently has been almost entirely ignored, and dragon has been generally substituted for him—I mean *the jackal*; *canis aureus*. It was this animal whose howlings on the last night of 1869 so delighted me as I lay in the open air at New Jericho, but a few miles from the Jordan. No concert of human voices could have charmed me so much as did the howlings of that company of jackals, since they called up to my mind and illustrated passages of Holy Writ. The jackal is closely allied to the dog, and is much larger than a fox. He lives in the desert, and when any city in the Orient goes to ruin, and the inhabitants leave, the jackal comes in and claims it as his own. There are about *seventeen* passages in the Old Testament in which the Hebrew should be translated jackal. In about *thirteen* of these the revisers have substituted this word instead of that of King James's version. Thus, after many centuries, justice has been done to this long-neglected animal, who has howled through the ages and waited for recognition. Jackal has been inserted in the following passages: Psa. xlv, 19; Isa. xiii, 22; xxxiv, 13; xxxv, 7; xliii, 20; Jer. ix, 11; x, 22; xiv, 6; xlix, 33; li, 37; Mic. i, 8; Job xxx, 29; Lam. iv, 3. The sense of these passages is brought out in a very vivid and striking manner by reading *jackals* in them. Thus, in reference to the overthrow of Babylon: "And jackals shall howl in the pleasant palaces." (Isa. xiii, 22.) In reference to Edom it is said: "And it shall be a habitation of jackals" (xxxiv, 13); that is, it shall be a desert. Again, in reference to Jerusalem: "I will make Jerusalem heaps, a dwelling place of jackals." (Jer. ix, 11.) In reference to the animal's howl, Job says: "I am a brother to jackals" (xxx, 29); and Micah: "I will make a wailing like the jackals" (i, 8). And, to show that a desolate place shall become fruitful, it is said: "In the habitation of jackals, where they lay, shall be grass with reeds and rushes." (Isa. xxxv, 7.)

From the natural history of the Old Testament we pass to the consideration of matters of still deeper interest, and take up *sheol*. This Hebrew word שְׁאוֹל, or שֹׁאֵל, *sheol*, has generally been derived from שָׁאַל, *to ask, demand*, since it is *all devouring, insatiable*. But Gesenius derives it from שֹׁאֵל, *a cavity*. The Hebrews conceived *sheol* as a vast subterranean place full of thick darkness and very deep (Job xi, 8; Dent. xxxii, 22; Psa. cxxxix, 8); the habitation of the souls of the departed. (Psa. xvi, 10; lxxxviii, 11; Prov. ii, 18; ix, 18; Isa. xiv, 9; xxvi, 14.) The dying are said to go down to *sheol*. (Num. xvi, 30; Gen. xlii, 38.)

Sheol occurs sixty-five times in the Hebrew Bible. The revisers translate the word *pit* in five places (Num. xvi, 30, 33; Dent. xxxii, 22; Psa. lv, 15; lxxxvi, 13). In *eighteen* places they render it *grave* (Gen. xxxvii, 35; xlii, 38; xliv, 29, 31; 1 Sam. ii, 6; 1 Kings ii, 6, 9; Prov. xxx, 16; Isa. xxxviii, 10, 18; Hos. xiii, 14, twice; Eccles. ix, 10; Cant. viii, 6; Psa. cxli, 7). In *eighteen* places they translate it *hell* (Isa. v, 14; xiv, 9, 11, 15; xxviii, 15, 18; lvii, 9; Ezek. xxxi, 15, 16, 17; Hab. ii, 5; Amos ix, 2; Jon. ii, 2; Ezek. xxxii, 21, 27). In *thirty* places they have simply transferred the Hebrew word to the English text, and leave it *sheol* (2 Sam. xxii, 6; Job vii, 9; xi, 8; xiv, 13; xvii, 13, 16; xxi, 13; xxiv, 19; xxvi, 6; Psa. vi, 5; xvi, 10; xxx, 3; xxxi, 17; xlix, 14, 15; lxxxviii, 3; lxxxix, 48; cxvi, 3; cxxxix, 8; Prov. i, 12; v, 5; vii, 27; ix, 18; xv, 11, 24; xxiii, 14; xxvii, 20).

In the Peshito Syriac translation, in every instance *sheol* is represented by the Syriac *P'shûl*. In the Septuagint, in every case except *three*, the word is rendered by the Greek ᾠδης, *Hades*, the *underworld*. In the three exceptional cases, it is rendered θάνατος, *death* (2 Sam. xxii, 6; Prov. xxiii, 14); and βόθρος, *pit* (Ezek. xxxii, 21).

The Vulgate, in more than one half of the places, renders *sheol* by *infernus*, less than half by *inferus*, both words meaning, *the lower regions*. Once it is translated *mors*, *death* (Hos. xiii, 14).

In the excellent German translation of Dr. De Wette, *sheol* is rendered "*unterwelt*," *the lower world*, except the single instance of 1 Kings ii, 6, where it is rendered "*grube*," *a pit*.

In the English language there is no word that is equivalent to

sheol, and therefore it should have been transferred to the English text in every instance.* The word first occurs in Gen. xxxvii, 35, where Jacob says, "I will go down to *sheol* to my son mourning." The Mosaic system and the Old Testament in general contain no revelation respecting *sheol*. Undoubtedly the ancient Hebrews expected future retribution, but the Mosaic legislation is silent concerning it. Life and immortality have been brought to light through the Gospel. (2 Tim. i, 10.)

In numerous passages in the Old Testament occurs the word יהוה *Yehovah*, which was doubtless pronounced in the early period of Old Testament history *Yahveh* or *Yahweh*, as the future tense of the verb יהה, *to be*, the *Absolute Being*. King James's version in a few instances transfers the word to the English text, but in most instances it gives "the LORD" as its equivalent, printed in capitals. The revisers have adhered to King James's version, without any good reason, but merely following the superstition of the Jews, who, since several centuries before Christ, have refused to pronounce the name *Jehovah*. Far better would it have been to transfer it to the English text. Thus in Psa. cxliv, 15, the insertion of the word *Jehovah* in the place of the LORD, makes the passage more emphatic: "Happy is that people whose God is *Jehovah*."

The rest of our remarks will be made upon the rendering of single words, without any attempt to reduce them to classes, and following the order in which they are found in the English Bible.

In Gen. i, 2, the Revised Version has, "and the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." The margin reads, "Or, *was brooding upon*," instead of *moved*. "Was brooding" should have been put into the revised text. The Hebrew participle, מְרַחֵץ, *m'rachepheth*, piel conjugation, is *kept brooding*. This same verb in this conjugation is used in Dent. xxxii, 11, of an eagle *brooding over* or *cherishing* its young. The Peshito Syriac has the same verb with the same force as the Hebrew, *brooding over*.

Cain's language, after the Lord had pronounced a curse upon him, is: "My crime is too great to be forgiven," and is

* In King James's Version, *sheol* is rendered *grave* in about one half of the places; in the other half it is rendered *hell*, with the exception of Job xvii, 16, Num. xvi, 30, 33, where it is rendered *pit*.

thus understood by Gesenius, and is so rendered by the Septuagint, the Targum of Onkelos, the Peshito Syriac, and the Vulgate. The revisers, therefore, should have put this rendering in the text, instead of setting it on the margin and allowing the text to stand as it is in King James's version.

In Gen. vi, 3, the revised text is, "My spirit shall not strive with man forever, for that he also is flesh, yet shall his days be a hundred and twenty years." The Septuagint renders the first part of it: "My spirit shall not always abide in these men forever." Targum of Onkelos: "This wicked generation shall not stand before me forever." Peshito Syriac: "Not shall my spirit abide in man forever." Vulgate: "Not shall my spirit remain in man forever." The Hebrew word rendered *strive* is יָדָח, *yadhon*, which Gesenius gives as the future of יָדַע, *dún*, or יָדָן, *dôn*, to be made low, and thus translates the passage in his *Thesaurus of the Hebrew Language*: "My spirit shall not be forever abased in man; that is," says he, "my heavenly and divine nature, which I breathed into man when I created him, shall not forever dwell in a mortal body since it is a habitation unworthy of it." The great Oriental scholar, Ewald, in his critical Hebrew Grammar, renders the Hebrew verb (translated *strive*), *niedrig sein*, to be low. Fürst, in his Hebrew Lexicon, renders it, "My spirit shall not rule over men." In a similar way De Wette translates the passage, though at the foot of the page he gives other renderings. But this latter rendering does not suit the facts of the case; for the spirit of God did not rule over these wicked antediluvians, and the meaning "*strive*" has but little support. Gesenius's version, "My spirit shall not be forever abased in man," is far better.

In Gen. xli, 43, occurs the word אֲבִרֶךָ, *abrêk*, rendered "bow the knee" (as if *hiphil* from אָבַד), both in King James's version and in the revised edition. The word is of uncertain origin, but probably Egyptian. It is the command that Pharaoh's criers gave the people respecting the honor to be rendered Joseph. The Targum of Onkelos renders it, "Father of the king." The Peshito Syriac has, "Father and ruler," titles given to Joseph. Friedrich Delitzsch, in his *Prolegomena* to a Hebrew-Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament, published during the last year, deems the word the same as the

Assyrian *abarakku, grand-vizier*. But what close relationship can be shown to have existed between Egypt and Assyria eighteen hundred years before Christ? Or had the Assyrians themselves, at that time, any such word or office? The word may be Egyptian, *apherek, bow the head*.

On the margin of Gen. xlix, 10, "until Shiloh come," the revision gives several alternate translations, of which the first is, "until he come to Shiloh having the obedience of the peoples." This marginal rendering is perfectly gratuitous. Not a vestige of such a translation, so far as we know, is found until the *twelfth* century, when Aben Ezra raises the question whether it might not be understood of coming to Shiloh. In the Authorized Version, in Exod. iii, 22, xi, 2, the children of Israel are directed *to borrow* of their neighbors jewels of gold and silver; and in Exod. xii, 35, it is stated that the children of Israel borrowed of the Egyptians jewels of silver and jewels of gold, and raiment. In these passages the revised edition has "ask." In this rendering of שָׁאַל, *shā'al*, the revisers are right, for we find that this verb occurs more than one hundred and sixty times in the Old Testament, and in about *three* passages only—leaving out those under consideration—can it be rendered *borrow*, but to *ask, demand*, etc., and in Prov. xx, 4, it means *to beg*. In conformity with this meaning the revisers have translated the hiphil form, שִׁחַל, *hishil*, *let them have what they asked*, instead of "lent," as in King James's version. The hiphil of "ask" being *causative*, naturally means *to cause to ask, to give freely*. Besides this passage, the hiphil form is found elsewhere only in 1 Sam. i, 28, respecting Samuel. Hannah says: "I have granted him (*given him freely*) to the LORD all the days which he shall live." Here *lending* would be unsuitable, as no return of Samuel to his mother was required or expected. The word indicating *lending*, in various places in the Old Testament, is לָוָה. The hiphil form of this verb is הִלָּה, *to lend*. It is thus seen that the Hebrews had a word different from הִשָּׁאל to express *lending*. This verb הִלָּה, *to lend*, is used *eight* times in the Old Testament.

The *third* commandment (Exodus xx, 7) is thus rendered in King James's version: "Thou shalt not take the name of the LORD thy God in vain; for *the* LORD will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain." The revised edition con-

tains precisely the same language, but puts in the margin, as an alternate translation: "Or, *for vanity or falsehood.*" We decidedly object to this translation, and give the following: "*Thou shalt not lift up* (invoke) the name of Jehovah thy God upon that which is false; for not will Jehovah acquit the one who lifts up (invokes) his name upon that which is false." It is a prohibition of false swearing. The word rendered "in vain" is נֶפֶשׁ, with the preposition and article prefixed, וְנֶפֶשׁ, *for or upon that which is false.* This word occurs in the sense of *falsehood* in Exod. xxiii, 1: "Thou shalt not take up a report of *falsehood*;" and in Deut. v, 20: "Thou shalt not bear a testimony of *falsehood* against thy neighbor." In Deut. v, 11, we have a repetition of this same commandment, where this same word twice occurs. Nowhere else in the Pentateuch is the word found. Outside of the Pentateuch it occurs in about *fifty* instances, mostly in the sense of *falsehood*, although our revisers, in nearly all cases, have *vanity* in their text. Gesenius, the greatest of Hebrew lexicographers, translates the passage: *Thou shalt not utter the name of Jehovah upon a falsehood*, that is, thou shalt not swear falsely. Fürst, in his Hebrew Lexicon, renders the word in this passage (נֶפֶשׁ, *shav*), *falsehood*. The Peshito Syriac renders it, "Thou shalt not swear by the name of the Lord thy God in a falsehood." The Targum of Onkelos refers the passage to swearing to what is useless or false. Dr. De Wette, in his excellent German translation, renders the passage: "Thou shalt not utter the name of Jehovah thy God upon an untruth."

About thirty-five years ago, in the early stage of my biblical studies, I addressed a letter to one of the greatest biblical scholars this country has produced, Professor Moses Stuart, of Andover, making inquiry of him respecting this text and some other matter. In reply to my question he remarks: "The third commandment, beyond all reasonable doubt, means: *Thou shalt not solemnly utter a falsehood.* God's name was included in an oath; to swear falsely is utterly prohibited. Due reverence for God forecloses it. If the sentiment of our English version were the true one, the Hebrew must be נֶפֶשׁ, that is, *sine causa, gratuitously.* Although the meaning of נֶפֶשׁ may be *vain, useless*, yet this comes only in a secondary way from its proper meaning—

falsehood, lie. The shade of meaning, *sine causa, gratuito*, belongs not to it. The case is a clear one."

We pass next to the Book of Job. The first thing that claims our attention is the translation of the verb קָנַן , given by our revisers in Job i, 5, 11; ii, 5, 9. Instead of "curse," as in King James's version, they render the verb *renounce*; and Job is made to express his fear that his sons may have "sinned and *renounced* God in their hearts." Satan says of Job, that if God takes away his property he *will renounce* him to his face. He repeats the same thing if Job's bone and flesh should be touched. Job's wife is made to say: "*Renounce* God and die." Our revisers, however, put in the margin, as an alternate translation, "Or, *blasphemed*." The primary meaning of the word קָנַן , is, *to bend the knee*, and in piel conjugation it means *to bless*, certainly in most of the passages of the Old Testament. But the question is, does it not sometimes have the opposite meaning, of imploring, not a blessing, but a *curse*? Gesenius contends that it has sometimes this *bad* sense, and he adduces in illustration of this the usage of this same word both in *Arabic* and *Ethiopic*, cognate languages, *to bless* and *to curse*. To these instances I would add the Greek $\alpha\pi\acute{o}\kappa\alpha\iota$, *to invoke good things* upon any one, as in Herodotus, i, 132; and *to curse*, as in the Alcestis of Euripides: 'Απὲ γονεῶν , "*Thou cursest thy parents*." "Some interpreters," says Gesenius, "as A. Schultens, are not fully satisfied that the sense of cursing belongs to this verb; they therefore derive from the idea of bidding farewell the signification *to deny, to renounce*." That is, because the Hebrews often *blessed* persons when leaving them, these critics suppose that the verb may mean *abandon*. But of the numerous instances (about two hundred and twenty-seven) in which this piel conjugation of the verb is used, we have not found one case where *to bless* is used to express *taking leave of*, or *abandoning*, waiving the few passages under consideration. To *bless* is not sufficient to indicate parting.

Thus in Josh. xxii, 6: "So Joshua *blessed* them and sent them away." Again, when he "sent them away also unto their tents, then he *blessed* them." It was a very common thing to *bless* persons when first meeting them. Here it is plain that *blessing* of itself does not indicate dismissal. And even *bidding farewell* to persons, in most cases, is of a friendly nature

and perhaps as often indicates *their leaving* us as our leaving them. Let us consider first, the clearest instances in which this verb means *to curse*. In 1 Kings xxi, 7-13, is an account of the means by which Jezebel contrived to obtain Naboth's vineyard for Ahab. Two wicked men were to be set before Naboth to bear witness against him, saying, "Thou didst *curse* God and the king." This plot was executed, and two wicked men bore testimony against him, saying, "Naboth did *curse* God and the king." The consequence was, that they stoned Naboth to death. In this narrative בָּרַךְ is used to express the insulting language used toward God and the king, and it can be properly indicated by nothing less than to *curse*, and is so rendered by the revisers, though they put *renounce* on the margin as an alternate rendering. But this latter rendering is inadmissible. For the witnesses against Naboth must have represented him as using bitter language against God and the king. But this would be something more than an *abandonment* of God and the king. Further, the law of Moses enacts: "Thou shalt not revile God nor curse the ruler of thy people" (Exod. xxii, 28); "and he that blasphemeth the name of Jehovah, he shall surely be put to death; all the congregation shall certainly stone him." (Lev. xxiv, 16.) The stoning of Naboth must then have been for blasphemy, that is *cursing* the divine name, as the Hebrew נָקַב means. It is perfectly clear then that Naboth was represented as *cursing*. Hence it is clear that in this passage בָּרַךְ means *to curse*. Likewise in Psa. x, 3, בָּרַךְ means *to curse*: "The plunderer curses and despises God." Let us now take up the passages in Job where בָּרַךְ means to curse. In i, 11, Satan says to God: "Touch all that he (Job) has, he will *curse* thee to thy face." Nothing weaker than *to curse* does the devil justice here. And what fitness would there be in his saying, He will bid thee *farewell* or *abandon* thee to thy face? In abandonment, the back is turned upon the person. In ii, 5, Satan uses the same language. Here too the verb must certainly have the same meaning of *curse*. In i, 5, Job is represented as making offerings for his sons and saying, Perhaps they may have sinned and *cursed* God in their hearts. Here *cursed* is not unsuitable. The same remark may be made of the advice of Job's wife, *Curse* God and die. The Peshito Syriac, both in 1 Kings xxi, 7-13, and in the four pas-

sages in Job under consideration, render צָרָה by *tsachi*, to curse. Gesenius translates the word in these passages *to curse*, with the exception of the passage containing the advice of Job's wife, which Gesenius translates, *Bless God and die*; that is, Your piety avails you nothing. De Wette renders the two passages in 1 Kings xxi, *blasphemed God and the king*, but the passages in Job we have been considering he translates, *entsagen*, renounce, instead of *curse*. But he gives as an alternate version of the passage respecting Job's wife, "Only praise God, you must still die."

In Job v, 7, the revisers adhere to King James's translation: "Man is born unto trouble as the sparks fly upward." The Hebrew reads: "Man is born to trouble, and the sons of lightning (or *flame*) to soar aloft." In Psa. lxxvi, 3, arrows are called the lightnings of the bow; and in Psa. lxxviii, 48, the word רָעָם is used for the lightnings of heaven. In Cant. viii, 6, it means *flame*, and in Hab. iii, 5, it has the sense *flame* or *pestilence*. So in Deut. xxxii, 24. Gesenius renders the last part of the passage "*sons of lightning*." "That is, birds of prey," says he, "which fly swift as the lightning." In this he has the support of all the ancient versions: Septuagint, "The vulture's brood soars on high;" Peshito Syriac, "The sons of the bird of prey soar on high;" Latin Vulgate, "Man is born for labor and the bird for flying." The Targum translates this passage in nearly the same way as the English version. De Wette renders it: "As the sons of lightning fly aloft," which he explains in a note: "That is, birds of prey flying as swift as the lightning." The translation, "as sparks fly upward," is very tame and incorrect. The Hebrew is literally to *make high in flying*, that is, *fly aloft*; sparks do not go high, unless in some great conflagration. But the comparison that man is *born to, destined to, toil and trouble, as the birds of prey are destined by their Maker to soar aloft*, is sublime, true, and beautiful.

We now come to that vexed and difficult passage in the Book of Job, chap. xix, 25-27, which the revisers render as follows: "But I know that my redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand up at the last upon the earth: and after my skin hath been thus destroyed, yet from my flesh shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another."

On the margin they give several alternate translations. This version of the passage is far better than that of King James's translation, and we prefer it to that recommended by the American Advisory Committee. The twenty-sixth verse is the most difficult. Gesenius, in his *Thesaurus of the Hebrew Language*, thus renders it: "After they shall have destroyed (*will be destroyed*) my skin, shall this be, will surely come to pass, that which had been mentioned in the previous verse, the advent of God; or, *After my skin which they have destroyed shall this be.*" The great Hebrew grammarian and Oriental scholar, Ewald, in the eighth edition of his *Grammar*, thus translates the principal clause: "After they have smitten my skin," that is, impersonal, "my skin has been smitten." De Wette thus translates: "After this skin of mine shall be destroyed, also without flesh [indicative of the highest degree of leanness] shall I yet see God." The Septuagint thus translates the whole passage: "For I know that the Eternal is the one who is about to deliver me upon the earth, to restore my skin that endureth these things. For these things have been accomplished for me from the Lord, which things I know by myself, which my eye has seen and not another" (*ἄλλος*). The Peshito Syriac thus renders it: "And I know that my redeemer liveth, and at last he will be revealed upon the earth, and to my skin and to my flesh have happened these things. If mine eye shall see God, my reins shall see light," etc. The Targum on Job translates the Hebrew into Chaldee thus: "And I know that my redeemer lives, and after this his deliverance shall appear upon the earth; and after my skin is swollen (restored) this will be, and from my flesh I shall still see God, whom I shall see for myself, and my eyes shall behold, and not a stranger." The Latin Vulgate thus translates the passage: "For I know that my redeemer lives, and that I shall rise from the earth on the last day: and again I shall be clothed with my skin, and in my flesh I shall see my God, whom I myself shall see, and my eyes shall behold and not another (*alius*)."
Here the passage is for the *first* time referred to the resurrection of the dead, so far as we know. But the context clearly shows that the passage has no reference to the resurrection. In the verses preceding the passage Job complains bitterly of the treatment he receives from his friends, and

expresses strongly the wish that his words might be written in a book, that is, for future reference and permanency. He declares his confidence that God will vindicate him from all the charges brought against him, and that these calamities will not result in his death, for in his flesh he shall see God. With this compare the latter part of the book, where the LORD answers Job out of the whirlwind, after which he addresses the Almighty, and says: "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth thee." And the Lord himself says to Eliphaz the Temanite, "My wrath is kindled against thee and against thy two friends: for ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, as my servant Job hath." It is also stated that the Lord turned the captivity of Job, and gave him twice as much as he had before. Thus was he vindicated. Job did not expect that his afflictions would terminate fatally, since he says (chap. xvi, 22): "For when a few years are come, I shall go the way whence I shall not return."

The Revised Version of the Book of Job, in its accuracy, if not in elegance of diction, is superior to King James's translation. The Revised Version of the Psalms is a decided improvement on the Authorized Version. It is not, however, free from error. The author of the 119th Psalm is made to say in the fourteenth verse: "I have rejoiced in the way of thy testimonies, as much as in all riches," which certainly does no great credit to his love and zeal. The Hebrew is as follows: "I rejoice in the way of thy testimonies as over the sum (or totality) of wealth. The preposition *כִּי*, rendered in the English translations by "as much as," simply means *as*. That our revisers have done great injustice to the psalmist he himself will tell us; for he says in verse 72: "The law of thy mouth is better to me than thousands of gold and silver." Again, in verse 127: "Therefore I love thy commandments above gold, yea, above fine gold."

This revised English translation, as a whole, is greatly to be preferred to King James's translation, and should be substituted for it whenever a new English Bible is needed. We think the Old Testament revision is better executed than that of the New, although the revision of the latter, as a whole, is to be preferred to King James's translation.

ART. VI.—THE EXALTATION OF JESUS.

“Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of *things* in heaven and *things* on earth and *things* under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.” Phil. ii, 9–11, *Rev. Version*.

WHEN allusion is made in prophecy to our Lord's humiliation, it is usually found to be in close connection with that which is its counterpart—his exaltation. The contemplation of the one invites to the contemplation of the other. For instance, he who is described in Isaiah liii as God's “righteous servant” is not only foretold as “despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief,” but is also set before us as at length having the divine promise fulfilled in regard to him: “Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong.” In this respect doctrinal statement is at one with prophetic. They both represent the Saviour's humiliation and exaltation as mutually explanatory. They both connect these two aspects of his work by a “wherefore.” As the result and the direct reward of his self-abasement, he is “highly exalted.” We have his own corresponding declaration too, given to his wondering disciples on the way to Emmaus, all the more significant as having been uttered in the time between his resurrection and ascension: “Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?” In the present connection the exaltation, therefore, is alluded to as being a twin thought with the humiliation. In the apostle's mind the one inevitably suggests the other. But there is another reason, another purpose, in the reference. It continues the illustration and enforcement of the Christian duties of unselfishness and humility. It supplies a new motive for seeking earnestly these “best gifts”—even the motive of self-interest. Scripture is not slow to ply men even with such an appeal. It shows us how self-sacrificing meekness yields in the end its own solid and eternal gain. That earthly flower bears heavenly fruit. Our Lord himself has said, in the parable of the Wedding Guests (Luke xiv, 11), and again in that of the Pharisee and Publican (Luke xviii, 14), “Every one that

exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted." With the example of such teaching from the Great Teacher's own lips, the apostle does not hesitate, nor need we, to inculcate the duty of showing forth this lowliest and loveliest grace by an appeal to the reward which is at last to crown it. In our Lord's exaltation, therefore, we have the pattern and pledge of our own.

But is there no heresy lurking in our thus explaining the particle "wherefore"—no tinge of Arianism in our thus regarding the Saviour's glory as the recompense of his obedience, and nothing more? Not in the least degree. He who is thus highly exalted is not viewed here as Son of God simply, in his own essence the infinite Being, through whom and in whom all things were created. As such, it is quite true, he could not be exalted, for he is over and above all. But he is contemplated as the God-man, in his totality, if we may dare so to speak. As Son of God he is now what and where he ever was; but having, by his humiliation, united humanity with divinity, he is now in the body of his humiliation highly exalted, even at God's right hand—"high-throned above all height." In this connection it is to be observed that the words run, not "God hath highly exalted him, and given him," but, as in the Revised Version, "God highly exalted him, and gave unto him." The language, that is to say, describes a definite act—something that took place at a certain time and in a certain way, not the state or condition resulting from it. The act of giving, not the fact of having given, is what is emphasized. So similarly Eph. i, 22, and 1 Pet. i, 21, "God *gave* him glory." But there is yet another aspect of this mystery which we are invited reverently to scan. "Wherefore also God highly exalted him." The previous verses show us what the Son of God did. He, the Lord of glory, "emptied himself"—"he humbled himself." This verse now shows us what God "also"—God on his part—did. *He* exalted the Son of man. The Son of man did not exalt himself. He was "obedient" unto God, and God has rewarded his obedience. He humbled himself in assuming human nature, and therefore in that same nature God highly exalted him. This super-exaltation, then, is described as of God's favor. The following clause brings this out yet more clearly: "And gave unto him the name which is above every

name." It is a free gift (*ἐχαρίσατο*). The word, which in the New Testament is peculiar to Luke and Paul, means graciously to bestow; not merely to grant, but to grant as a token of loving approval. Our Lord "counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God." So far from grasping this for himself as of right, he emptied himself of it; and now he has received all this and more, for now it is as God-man that he receives it, as the free gift of the Father. It is a gift in answer to his own earthly prayer—a prayer in which he conceives his earthly ministry is already done: "I have glorified thee on earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." Now, in dealing with such a theme as this, we ought ever to confess, and that with adoring awe, that we cannot attain to knowledge.

"For knowledge is the swallow on the lake
That sees and stirs the surface-shadow there,
But never yet hath dipt into the abyss."

We have, therefore, when we speak at all, to have our words well ordered. They are nowhere better ordered than in a passage in Origen (*Com. in Johan.*—quoted by Wordsworth on Eph. i, 22), which runs thus: "He is said to be *exalted*, as having wanted [been without] it before; but in respect only of his *humanity*: and he has a name *given* him, as it were a matter of favor, *which is above every name*, as the blessed apostle Paul expresses it. But in truth and reality this was not the *giving* him any thing which he naturally had not from the beginning; so far from it, that we are rather to esteem it his returning to what he had in the beginning, essentially and unalterably; on which ground it is that he, having condescended, *οἰκονομικῶς*, to put on the humble garb of humanity, said, 'Father, glorify me with the glory which I had.' For he was always invested with divine glory, having been co-existent with his Father before all ages, and before all time, and the foundation of the world."

But to return, what of "*the Name*," as the Revised Version rightly renders it? Name has been defined as the "summary of the person" (Vaughan). Though men often fail to see it, through the blinding effect of use, the conferring of a name is designed to have a deep significance. This holds good pre-em-

inently in the biblical conception of name-giving. We see this in the dealing of the covenant-God with his saints in the old dispensation, and in the dealing of our Lord with his followers in the new. The same idea is prominent here in God the Father's giving a name to God the Son after, and because of, his humiliation. Now, it has been held that the name given to the exalted Saviour is none other than the incommunicable name of Jehovah, or the name of the Lord proclaimed to Moses from out of the cloud on Mount Sinai (Exod. xxxiv, 6, 7); or, again, that it is the title "Son of God," he having been declared such "with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead" (Rom. i, 4), or "the Word of God," or "King of kings and Lord of lords." Rev. xix, 13, 16. These solutions are not probable. Nor is the term "name" to be explained away as equivalent simply to dignity, majesty. The general context, as well as a reference to such passages as Acts ii, 36, iii, 26, ix, 5, suggests rather that the name is none other than the name "Jesus." This was his indeed by divine command "before he was conceived in the womb." It is his still, for, as Peter's pentecostal sermon declares, "God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." And he delighted to claim it, in the very act of calling Paul himself to service: "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." But it is now, as it were, given anew, for that name which on earth was looked upon as the lowliest and most despised among men is now the highest in heaven, invested with all the glory of his accomplished work—a name far above that of prophet, priest, or king—a name above all angels and arch-angels—a name most blessed in this, that it can never be torn from the hearts of humble men. It is "the Name," for thus it stands solitary in its unapproachable grandeur in one New Testament passage (3 John, ver. 7), by believing on which men are saved, and for the sake of which, doing and enduring all things, they themselves shall at last overcome, and realize the promise vouchsafed to the victor, "I will give him the white stone, and in the stone a new name written, which no man knoweth saving he that receiveth it."

The tenth verse carries on this thought, "that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of *things* in heaven and *things* on earth and *things* under the earth," or, as in the margin of

the Revised Version, "things of the world below." This apparently signifies that throughout the limitless universe the whole intelligent creation will worship him. But who are these specifically who render this worship? It has been conjectured (Webster and Wilkinson) that the threefold division answers to that which the pagan world made of their deities (*Iliad*, iii, 276-279), and is here introduced as a gloss upon a passage which predicts universal submission to the one true God, as contrasted with the heathen objects of worship; intimating the subjection and homage of all spiritual powers and beings to Christ, as Lord of heaven and earth, the holder of the keys of "the invisible world and of death." This is altogether fanciful; so likewise is the other extreme—the view which understands the reference as pointing to Christians, Jews, and heathen. It is safer, upon the whole, to refrain from pressing the division too severely. The leading idea is simply universality—all creatures capable of rendering homage, whatever be the conditions of their existence. We may profitably compare Rev. v, 3: "And no man in heaven, nor in earth, neither under the earth, was able to open the book, neither to look thereon." Compare also Rev. v, 13, which is even more to the point, as it speaks of adoration rendered. Angels and archangels, all heavenly intelligences who behold his face where he is in heaven—men who are or are to be on earth, who have heard or are yet to hear about him—those who are asleep in the spirit world awaiting his coming, but even now rendering a present homage, the abode of departed spirits being popularly represented in ancient thought as the under-world. It seems better to exclude the idea of the spirits of evil here, for "the homage of impotence or subjugated malice" (Ellicott) is foreign to the thought of the passage. It is at least not suggested by bowing the knee, nor is it by the word Hades, which does not represent their abode. Besides, their homage could not be "in the name of Jesus," in whatever way we understand that phrase. But, following both the Received and the Revised Versions, others, notably Lightfoot, with considerable reason, relying upon Rev. v, 13, Eph. i, 20-22, Rom. viii, 22, understand *things* instead of *persons*. But while it is assured truth that all the universe, animate and inanimate, must render praise to the Redeemer, the figure of bowing the knee points only to intelligent homage, and so, too,

do the words following—"every tongue confess." It is better, therefore, so to restrict it, and this is in effect not to detract from the universality of the adoration, but only to define the nature of the adoration that is described. Our Lord himself, before his ascension, said to his disciples: "All power (authority) is given to me in heaven and on earth," and the seer of the latter days heard the loud voice saying in heaven, "Now is come the power (authority) of his (God's) Christ." This name of Jesus, then, thus magnified beyond all human thought, is "a name which, being pronounced, as it were, makes the very universe quiver with spontaneous and irresistible enthusiasm." *

We have thus substantially already fixed the meaning of the passage: to bow the knee is to do obeisance, to render homage. But here a point presents itself; is not the bowing of the knee only homage rendered to God the Father "in the name of Jesus," and therefore the homage of prayer simply, and that given to God in Jesus's name? Some most orthodox commentators, as, for example, Dr. Crawford (*The Atonement*, p. 108), take this view, making this an undoubted reference to Christ's intercession for us, as one of the chief purposes for which he has been thus exalted—"in the name of Jesus," as being that, of our only Intercessor, in whose name all prayer and supplication must be offered up. But, though the doctrine thus enunciated is most surely believed among us, it is totally alien to the scope of the present passage, for, first of all, the angels in heaven, the unfallen and pure intelligences of the universe, do not need to, and indeed cannot, pray in the name of such a Mediator and Intercessor; it is theirs simply to adore him as "Lord of all." Then, secondly, "in the name of" is a Hebraism (1 Chron. xiv, 10, and Psa. lxiii, 4, and elsewhere), and as such brings the God-man Jesus as closely as language can do into oneness with Jehovah. For instance, when the Psalmist says, "I will lift up my hands *in thy name*," he declares that he will adore God; and so, similarly, to bow the knee in Jesus's name is to adore Jesus. It is, therefore, not prayer through Jesus, but direct worship of Jesus, that is here set forth. Even rationalistic exegesis does not hesitate to accept this view (for example, Schenkel). The Revised rendering, therefore, is no proof, as Dean Burgon passionately complains, that the result

* Beecher, sermon on "The Name of Jesus."

of New Testament revision is unfavorable to orthodoxy.* It is not so at least here, if the words be but rightly understood, and his opponent, Dr. Vance Smith, has no warrant to speak thus: "The only instance in the New Testament in which the religious worship or adoration of Christ was apparently implied has been altered by the Revision: 'At the name of Jesus every knee shall bow' is now to be read 'in the name.' Moreover, no alteration of text or of translation will be found anywhere to make up for this loss; as, indeed, it is well understood that the New Testament contains neither precept nor example which really sanctions the religious worship of Jesus Christ."† This statement is glaringly incorrect. While then the revised rendering is to be accepted, the injurious inference wrongly drawn from it is unhesitatingly to be rejected. The whole passage, this and what follows, is undoubtedly modeled on Isa. xlv, 23: "I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear" (the words are directly cited in Rom. xiv, 11, 12). All this homage to God, then, is realized in the worship of Jesus. The next clause, "And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord," is more explicit than the preceding one. It refers to the open acknowledgment in humble, grateful praise—the public avowal of what before is confessed in the awful silence of the heart; and the confession is, that he is Lord—in the full, absolute sense, "Lord of all." And the final aim of all this worship of Jesus the God-man is "the glory of God the Father." We have our Lord's own comment upon this declaration: "I honor My Father. . . . I seek not mine own glory" (John viii, 49, 50); "He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father which hath sent him." So he spake on earth, and what he said holds good of him in heaven. But none the less, while the worship of Christ Jesus, direct and absolute, is warranted and enjoined, still, in the ineffable mystery of the Trinity, this worship of the Son glorifies God the Father. All this is infinitely beyond our ken. Yet must it be ours to

"Cling to faith beyond the forms of faith."

We have but to remember this, "that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." It is not by

* *The Revision Revised*, p. 513. † *Texts and Margins*, p. 47, cited by Burgon.

reasoning; it is by being spiritually minded, that the eye of the heart can see Christ Jesus, and the tongue confess him thus, "My Lord, and my God." He has given us this promise, "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my Father in heaven."

But we dare never forget that to confess him is to live to him. It is to have the same mind in us that was in him. Turning, therefore, once more back to the motive of this whole passage, the inculcation of the duty of self-sacrificing humility, we can say, in view of the reward in store,

"The saint that wears heaven's brightest crown
In deepest adoration bends,
The weight of glory bows her down
The most, when most her soul ascends.
Nearest the throne of God we see
What honor hath humility."

We can say more than this. We can learn the lesson of humility and its honor not merely in the saints around the throne, but most of all in Him who "in the white radiance of eternity" sits on the throne himself—even Jesus, who humbled himself, and is now highly exalted, "King of kings and Lord of lords."

EDITORIAL MISCELLANY.

CURRENT TOPICS.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM IN SUNDAY-SCHOOLS.

THE International Sunday-School Lessons constitute an agency in the religious teaching and culture of the times second in importance only to the doctrinal utterances of the evangelical pulpit. They year by year practically dictate the biblical reading and study of most of the children and youth of the land; and as well, that of a large portion of those of riper years. By this means they are instrumentally shaping the theological conceptions of those who must very soon occupy the foremost places in the families and schools and churches of the land. The views and ideas now being formulated in such minds must go with them through life; or, if ever gotten rid of, it must be by painful and perilous processes. All the wise sayings that have become the commonplaces of thought in respect to the determinative and abiding influences of early education—how the bending of the twig permanently inclines the tree, and how hard it is to teach old dogs new tricks—here become maxims of practical wisdom, and we are brought to contemplate a vast molding process in active operation, by which immortal souls are receiving impressions that are to be as lasting as their being. The thought is fearful to contemplate, in view of its magnitude and the preciousness of the interests involved.

The power that has fallen into the hands of those whose duty it is to select these lessons is great beyond all comparison, for they dictate to millions of the most susceptible minds what portions of Scripture they shall attend to from year to year, and by consequence what shall be omitted or passed by. As to the *personnel* of those who do this work, so far as we know them, we highly respect them; but their authority appears to be almost entirely underived, and in their actions they represent none but themselves and their own convictions. Perhaps they have done as well and wisely in the discharge of their responsible and delicate duties as any others could have done, however they might have been chosen, and representing whatever authority; but it is rather remarkable that such transcendent interests should have fallen into the hands of a self-appointed and irresponsible body of men. No special complaint is here intended to be made in respect to the work they have done, nor blame to them for doing it; but it becomes a grave question for those to whom, under God, belongs the high duty to guard against the possibility of wrong teaching in the Church, whether they are at liberty to devolve so high a function upon other and irresponsible persons.

The Sunday-schools of the country are no doubt doing an invaluable work, and it may be added that the International Lessons have been, and

perhaps continue to be, valuable as helps in that work. It may also be granted that the extraordinary powers wielded by those who shape that system of instruction appear to have been honestly and judiciously exercised; and if they have been doing a much-needed work, which nobody else has attempted, they can scarcely be blamed for their actions in the premises—perhaps they are deserving of thanks rather than blame. But from the fact that they are responsible to no power beyond themselves for their actions, and that their prescription of the successive yearly Scripture reading is absolute and not to be appealed from, the case is one to suggest the possibility of perils. Especially is this a matter to be thought of by the Church, in any of its denominational distributions, which is by its great Head put in charge of these interests; and the question may be pertinently asked whether it is lawful to devolve such an interest upon any self-appointed and irresponsible set of men, however wise and excellent. Back of all this is the pregnant fact that the Sunday-schools of this country have, from the beginning, assumed and had conceded to them a kind of independent individuality and an autonomy of their own, by which they appear, not as of the integrity of the Church but a separate and co-ordinate auxiliary. Is that a happy condition of things?

These thoughts are only preliminary to what we had in mind when we wrote the heading of this paper. As is well-known, the International Lessons for the first quarter of the current year were made up of portions of the history of the patriarchs, drawn from the book of Genesis. The narratives there given, contemplated apart from their special religious and theological designs, and simply in respect to their literary style and substance, are beautifully idyllic, and they abound with scenes of romantic heroism. But they are above all else theistical and specifically religious, and accordingly they have been often and effectively used by wise and devout parents and other instructors of young persons, as in the case of Doddridge's mother explaining the figures on the Dutch tiles, as valuable religious lessons and as incentives to piety and right living. But every competent teacher knows that the study of Genesis is not what it used to be, and that it cannot now be explained and "improved" as it was by his mother and grandmother. "The more is the pity," perhaps some will say, but the fact remains.

Readers of Sunday-school literature published during the last few months in books, and pamphlets, and leaflets, and in the periodicals, from the learned monthlies, and especially the weeklies, down to the "children's papers," have found them surcharged with expositions and discussions of the lives and the doings of the patriarchs and God's dealings with them. These commentaries cover a very wide area, and duly collated they do not show an entire harmony among their writers; and the whole, if thoroughly studied, might surfeit the susceptible and distract the thoughtful, and, possibly, lead the skeptically inclined to reject the whole as fatally self-destructive. Perhaps, however, something of this sort is unavoidable; it may be that the story of the *origines* of the human race must of necessity be revised and restated; but, if so, it may be asked

whether or not the Sunday-school is the place for its prosecution? Is it wise that such profound themes, before which the best instructed mature minds hesitate, should be submitted to the untaught and susceptible minds of children by callow and ill-informed teachers?

But what should be thought of the wisdom and discretion of choosing such a portion of Scripture for such a purpose? Protestants do indeed believe that no part of the teachings of the Bible should be withheld from any; but surely in giving to each his portion in due season a wise discretion should be exercised. An apostle dealing with some whom he compared to "little children" tells them that he had fed them with *milk*, and not with *strong meat*; and at a later day he complained that they were still unable to bear any other than the most elementary doctrines. But our wise almoners of the bread of life seem to discard all such discriminating cautiousness when they proceed to dictate lessons—the same to the infant class and the adult Bible class—which involve and are sure to bring to the front some of the most difficult questions in biblical criticism, in respect to which the most scholarly speak only very reservedly and ask time for further inquiry. Would it not have been better to give the children less difficult lessons, and left the confessedly hard-to-be-answered questions found in the patriarchal history to be examined and determined by those best able to deal with such matters?

The discussions of some of these things in the "lesson helps" found in some of the religious periodicals have led to a number of rather curious affairs. An official organ of one of our specifically evangelical Sunday-school organizations introduced Abraham, in the purposed offering of Isaac, as an only partially rescued subject of ancestral idolatry which inculcated the practice of human sacrifices. In another case, an editor of a great weekly, who had engaged an able and scholarly minister to prepare the exposition of the Sunday-school lessons, began very soon to detect an unusual odor about these contributions which reminded him of the "Higher Criticism," and made it necessary to subject the offered matter to a careful surveillance and the free use of the *penna expurgatoria*. Worst of all, the publisher of the incomparably ablest Sunday-school periodical in the world—*The Sunday-School Times*—having in his far-seeing and liberal enterprise engaged the pens of some of the ablest biblical scholars on both sides of the sea to fully expound the lessons and bring out all their hidden riches, soon found himself standing face to face with a rendering of the sacred narrative that would have delighted the hearts of the most advanced disciples of the school of Wellhausen, Kuenen, and Robertson Smith. But he was equal to the emergency, and the contract for supplies of that kind was peremptorily and speedily terminated. Now, these things are only what might have easily been foreseen, and they should have been anticipated by those who set the Sunday-schools at studying Genesis; and the Christian public should thank the editors who showed the courage to refuse to allow their periodicals to become the mediums for introducing distracting discussions of profound biblical questions among those who are necessarily unable to deal with them, and would quite certainly suffer

harm from them. But most that we have seen in print, and it may be presumed that the same thing has very generally prevailed in the Sunday-schools, has been quite guiltless of the "Higher Criticism;" and, instead, the commonplaces of a hundred years ago have appeared fitting in the strong light of the last quarter of the nineteenth century, like bats and owls overtaken by daylight.

We are not of those who lament the decadence of that kind of faith which subsists without regard to reason and reality, although it has its seeming advantages. But whatever may be any one's preferences, such a faith has become impossible. The thinking of the age, which no man, nor school, nor council can control or effectually limit—which moves slowly but as irresistibly as the glacier on the mountain-side—has changed its point of observation, and therefore very many things have taken on other aspects. Such changes of views are perpetually occurring, but in this case the transition is very wide, and it has come so suddenly that the same individual may find himself in one short life-time subsisting in two widely different worlds of thought, and facing in opposite directions. There are a few still living who received their first lessons out of the Bible during the early decades of the century but have kept themselves in close contact and lively sympathy with their shifting times; and these very well know that they have come into widely changed intellectual environments. They find themselves disqualified for the ready credence and the unquestioning acceptance of traditional beliefs of their earlier days, and they know that those golden days of easy credulity are forever gone; that the past cannot be recalled by any such miracle as that wrought upon the dial of Ahaz. The chick just escaped from the shell may shiver in the rough atmosphere, but it cannot by any possibility return to its former snug quarters. So though even superstition may have its charms, and possibly some real advantages, still the dews of the morning vanish before the rising sun, and the dreams of childhood—that of the great world as well as of individuals—though pleasant to think of, must give place to the sterner duties of manhood. It is probable that while by virtue of the reading and exposition of Genesis in the Sunday-schools some troublesome questions have been prematurely thrust into the foreground, and upon those least able to solve them and most likely to be harmed by their unskillful treatment, still the advent of those questions in the arena of popular thinking was inevitable. A transition away from the old methods of contemplating the history of the patriarchs, into another and broader one, is almost certain to be made in the near future. The word of King Canute commanding the flood-tide to turn back was no more impotent than must be any attempt, by whatever parties, to stay the tendency of the thought of the age.

It is, however, very desirable that a movement which, although fruitful of good in its ultimate results, may still prove harmful incidentally if unwisely managed, should be conducted wisely and discreetly. As soon as it was seen that certain traditional views of the teachings of the Old Testament were losing their hold upon the public mind, the enemies of

religion seized upon these changes, and pressed them in exaggerated proportions against the whole system of the Christian faith; and, to the great embarrassment of the only competent defenders of the faith, certain brave but incompetent and injudicious champions rushed into the combat and attempted to defend the indefensible outlying fancies with which superstition and ignorance had encumbered Christian truth, and these, by their unavoidable defeat, appeared to damage the whole case. But the contest in favor of the truth is now fairly undertaken by those who are equal to all its demands; and what is demonstrated by scholarly research must be given to the public, and so passed downward through all classes and grades of intelligence till the rectified conceptions of the teachings of the sacred history shall have become universal. The agency through which this may be effective is, first of all, the press—in the form of discussions in books and reviews and the higher classes of periodical literature. The platform of learned associations may contribute something, and, further along, the subject may be somewhat treated in the pulpit, but only with judicious reserve—tentatively and by implication, rather than dogmatically and controversially. The defense of the Gospel against the assaults of learned skepticism has been all along sadly handicapped by its incompetent self-appointed champions, by whom, in not a few cases, the pulpit has proved an effectual auxiliary to the learned infidel propaganda of our times. The Christian evidences should be dealt with only sparingly and incidentally by the pulpit, whose business is much less to set forth the credibility of the Gospel than to state its substance and to enforce its claims; and in the Sunday-school both the evidences of religion and all forms of biblical criticism are almost sure to do harm rather than good. The advice of Robert Hall to Eustace Carey respecting the kind of teaching required of a missionary among heathen is scarcely less applicable to religious teachers in all lands, that not “a circuitous course of instruction,” nor “an argumentative exposition of the principles of natural religion” is needed; but instead, “testimony,” and though not in fact, yet in manner, “dogmatic” declaration of the truth.

Our views in respect to the free use of legitimate biblical criticism, and of the intelligent, but reverent and cautious, re-examination of the theological formularies of former times, have been sufficiently indicated. But in order that this work shall be well and wisely done it must be intrusted to those whose pursuits have rendered them expert in it. It is not a work for children, of whatever stature or age; and all who are set to instruct the great technically unlearned masses should practically remember this in their ministrations.

FOREIGN, RELIGIOUS AND LITERARY.

MOLTKE IN THE GERMAN PARLIAMENT is a character of some importance in these days of stormy prognostications, and he is naturally a study to the quidnuncs who would gladly read his thoughts in the severe though impassive lines of his face. For whole months he will remain silently seated in his chosen place at the extreme right, entering among the first and not leaving until the close of the session. Reclining on his seat, and continually absorbed, he does not like to be interrupted in his reveries, and he hastily dispatches the neighboring deputies who come to shake his hand or draw the "silent man" into the snare of a conversation.

In his eighty-seventh year he still moves on with the period. Braced by his uniform he has a bold and upright bearing, and his little, bony head has quite a juvenile appearance; and the wig which the field-marshal wears contributes not a little to this impression. Until quite recently his hair was blonde, but the lively discussions regarding the famous *Septennate* seem to have cast the snows on his head, and his hair is now inclining to a silver gray. Moltke, unlike many other members, never takes to the tribune to speak. When he desires to say a few words, and the privilege has been granted by the presiding officer, he advances slowly into the hemicycle before the deputies. Then these gather around him, and a profound silence reigns, without the least demonstration from the gavel. His slow voice, a little trembling, gathers strength as he proceeds. His speeches are very short, but of a marvelous transparency and clearness—not a word is forgotten, not a syllable too much is uttered; and to this conciseness there is added the perfection of form. When the great soldier has finished he resumes his seat without a moment's delay.

LEO XIII. is a striking antithesis to Pius IX. Every thing seems to separate and place them in opposition—blood, education, and temperament. The famous Pio Nono was at once a monk and a soldier of a popular character, and obeying, above all things, his feelings of the hour. His theological learning was quite ordinary, and of dialectics he was totally destitute. His mind was not broad, but it was very ardent, and went directly to its aim with but a single leap. His reasoning was simple as that of childhood. Thus it may be said that his thoughts came to him not from research nor study, but from a species of inspiration and interior illumination. He never doubted, and he seldom discussed with himself or others. He had mystic intuitions and revelations that filled his soul and led it to its purpose. With him it was a swift and sure *non possumus*, which even Napoleon III. could not change.

In comparing the portraits of the present pope and his predecessor the contrast is very striking. The head of Pius IX. resembles that of a country curate, a little heavy, but full of kindness. Leo XIII., on the contrary, is tall, slender, and of an aristocratic mien. One can perceive the lord under the costume of the sovereign pontiff, and a ruler of men who would

have preferred to devote his time to study and asceticism. His head is lofty, and his features are very marked. Hair already white softens the natural dignity of his countenance, which appears rather dry than harsh. His literary and philosophical education has been very thorough, and his piety has always been very pronounced. His early teachers were the Jesuits, and their influence over him has always been strong. No pope for a long time has taken so much pains to broaden the studies of the Catholic clergy, and to encourage their efforts in this line.

The allocutions of Leo XIII. are always forcible, though they have not the fire of those of Pius IX. In these he does not so much insist on exclusive Roman Catholicism; his pen leans rather to an ideal *Christianity*. His religion is carefully separated from civil matters, and there is nothing puerile or superstitious in the devotion that he recommends; the names of the Virgin or the saints do not often find a place in his sermons. He does not repudiate the superstitions of his Church, but he does not bring them out in bold relief. There are, indeed, two characters in the present pontiff—the man and the sacred ruler; and it is interesting to see the first tremble and sacrifice itself before the second. And while Leo is faithful to himself he obeys with humility the decisions which he supposes God formulates for his mouth by the Church in council. He thus feels himself at times infallible, and again weak and powerless.

THE MEMORY OF PAUL BERT seems to be still greatly revered in France. It will be remembered that he was sent as special ambassador to Tonquin; as was thought, to get rid of a troublesome personage to the present *régime*. His remains were brought back to France, to repose, after a long voyage, in their native soil. The funeral ceremonies attracted to Huxeme a large concourse of distinguished men, and not a few of low estate; the presence of some, who for long hours awaited in silence the *cortège*, was very touching. A special train brought from Paris two or three hundred Parisians—deputies, savants, officials, journalists, and delegates of various associations. Indeed, the cemetery scarcely sufficed to contain all that came.

The coffin was placed on a catafalque adorned with the French tricolor veiled with crape, and a few Chinese flags; and the numerous family of the dead scientist and statesman were present in deep mourning. The ministers of the present administration were there in force, and the Secretary of State made a long discourse, in which he traced the career in China, as displayed by his dispatches, which produced quite a sensation. Bert had been greatly traduced during his absence, and his defense was complete. The Minister of Public Instruction, Bert's successor in office, quite to the astonishment of all, was very ardent in his defense. He acknowledged that Bert had been misunderstood and defamed, not only in his laborious life, but even in his death; and acknowledged that he had been sacrificed to the honor of his flag in sending him to a foreign post where his life paid the forfeit of his fidelity, for most of men would have refused to go there under the circumstances of the case.

Quite *apropos*, it would seem, M. Ranc has just used the words of Bert in a speech opposing a separation of Church and State, before the French Chambers. Bert believed in a union of Church and State as far as the Concordat is concerned, that the State might in this way secure a control over the Church and prevent the acrimony that would arise between the classes. He felt that in every household domestic quarrels would arise, and that every village would be divided into two camps. This violence done to the Church would give the village curate the opportunity to play the part of mischief-maker. These words of the dead statesman seem to have had their effect, for in their train came defeat to the proposition, and France is probably saved from a fierce religious struggle at the moment when, in the words of Gambetta, it is wiser for her to be watching the nation beyond the Vosges.

THE NATIONAL HYMNS OF EUROPE are again coming to the front in the excitement regarding a general war. General Boulanger, the French evil genius of the period, has ordered the bands of the army to study the national hymns of the principal lands. Now these airs are about as numerous as the countries of the world, and the task for the French musicians will not be a small one.

Above all, of course, for the French, is their own immortal war hymn, the "Marseillaise," which has stirred the hearts of multitudes to rush to "liberty or death." Besides the "Marseillaise," the Spaniards have one that saw the light in the same way, and touches the same strains of the Spanish heart. This is called the "Riego," and was composed by San Miguel, a poet and soldier, to incite the people against the despotism of Ferdinand VII. A youth of but seventeen composed the music in a few hours, he being an enthusiast for the rising liberty of the country.

The national hymn of Belgium is the "Brabançonne," in which we see its Brabant origin. It was composed in 1830, at the period of the great struggle against Holland. The words are by Jenneval, a famous player and poet, and the music by Campenhout. The author was killed in fighting for Belgian liberty. His countrymen paid him a posthumous homage by granting a pension to his mother.

"God Protect the Czar" is the famous Russian hymn. It was composed by General Alexis Livoff on his return from a visit with the Emperor Nicholas to Prussia and Austria; they heard the national hymns of these countries, and felt that they alone of all the countries of Europe should not be without a national anthem. When it was presented to the emperor he listened to it several times, declared it superb, and decreed its adoption for the country.

We need scarcely say that the national air of United Germany is "The Watch on the Rhine," with which the French are but too well acquainted; it has defended the sacred stream more than once at the price of blood. It was composed in the warlike effervescence of 1840, and replied to by the French poet, De Musset, in the song commencing, "We have had it, your German Rhine," and this bitter taunt inspired the Germans to take it back

in 1871. The words were written by a rather obscure German poet named Schneckenburg, whose worth was not acknowledged till after his death. The music was by Wilhelm, and it immediately touched and inspired the German heart.

VICTOR EMMANUEL's recognition by his own dear country is now complete. His monument in the Pantheon at Rome is now finished, and accepted by his family and the liberal element of all Italy. On the occasion of the recent anniversary of his death, King Humbert and Queen Margherita knelt in the Pantheon before his tomb, and listened to a low mass by the royal chaplain.

The temple was closed to the public during this time; the household of the court and the president of the association of veterans who have guarded the tomb of the patriot king were the only ones allowed to be present at the ceremony. But after the departure of the sovereigns and their suite the doors of the Church were thrown open to the local authorities, the patriotic societies of working-men, the deputations of the army, etc. These all defiled before the tomb, and laid on it their wreaths.

This ceremony will be repeated annually in the future. The reverence for the memory of the sovereign to whom Italy owes its unity and independence remains very vivid in the minds of the masses, and the pilgrimage to the Pantheon will always be performed with eagerness.

This year the king and queen have enjoyed the privilege of seeing the tomb of the "Father of his Country," for this is now the common appellation given to Victor Emmanuel. Nine years were consumed in endless discussions as to the form to be given to the monument. In the month of September last the king became fatigued at the delay, and ordered the adoption of a plan, and the completion of the monument by the anniversary of the hero's decease. By working night and day the work was completed.

THE QUIRINAL AND THE VATICAN still find it difficult to settle on a *modus vivendi*, notwithstanding so many reports to the contrary. The Minister of the Interior has just informed the Cardinal Archbishop of Turin that the amount of the annual appropriations to His Holiness now reaches the enormous sum of £2,000,000 sterling.

As it is now nineteen years that the Vatican has refused to receive the annual moneys from the State, the minister thinks the period arrived to declare that if this state of things continues for five years longer the period will have arrived to proclaim that the claim has lapsed. It is also known that the Pope has been informed of this correspondence, and that he has declared that there is nothing in the canon law forbidding a restitution, under some form, for the damage done by the loss of the temporal power. But he thinks that the reparation ought to be made to the Catholics of the world for the loss of their spiritual privileges in the ecclesiastical capital of the world, and because they have found it necessary to aid the Holy See by precarious subscriptions. From this it is easy to see that the Sovereign Pontiff endeavors *sub rosa* to contrive a means to receive this *nervus*

rerum for the Church, which he refuses on a sort of principle, as it might seem tacitly to acknowledge to the State the right to assume the temporal power of the Vatican on the condition of a large annual subsidy in lieu of it. It is quite probable, therefore, that in the near future the Church will find a means to accept this sum, which act will be likely to create serious difficulty to the Italian treasury.

"THE DRAMA OF QUERETARO," as the history and fate of Maximilian in Mexico is often called, has again been revived to the European mind by the publication of the memoirs of the deceased Chancellor Beust, who was better acquainted with the story of the catastrophe than any other living man. He was present at the interview in Strasburg, in 1867, between the Emperor Napoleon and the Emperor of Austria, brother of the victim and martyr, and knew the promises made by the ambitious French emperor. This was about the period of the famous Exposition of Paris, to which Napoleon invited most of the crowned heads of Europe, and which invitation many of them accepted.

In the beginning the Emperor of Austria had expected also to be there, but after the tragic end of Maximilian he found many diplomatic objections to making the visit. Apart from the bitter quarrel that this affair gave rise to in the imperial family of Austria, Francis Joseph felt himself deeply aggrieved by the conduct of Napoleon in having forced the crown on Maximilian and then deserting him in the hour of trial.

One day Francis Joseph bid his chancellor tell him the whole truth about the matter without reserve; and Beust did so, in the following manner: He reminded Francis Joseph that he had induced the King of Hanover to oppose Prussia, whereby he had lost his throne, and was not sustained by the Austrian emperor. It was a similar case, said Beust, between Napoleon III. and Maximilian. The French emperor did not dare risk a struggle with the United States, and he was forced to abandon Maximilian, as you were to abandon George V. Francis Joseph was magnanimous enough to accept these bitter words with the frankness with which they were given.

A TUNNEL UNDER THE SIMPLON is now the watchword of the French, who are extremely nettled at the fact of the success of that of St. Gothard, which puts Germany in such direct and easy communication with Italy. The Geographical Society of Paris is now discussing the question, and declares that a new tunnel will always pay if it is put through the Simplon range, which is decidedly the shortest route from Paris to Milan, and which the French believe will attract all commercial travelers and many tourists.

And there is a national and patriotic feeling connected with the Simplon, as this is the great pass put across the Swiss Alps by Napoleon in order to facilitate his access to Milan and Italy. The French will have the advantage of the large experience gained in such work by the Germans and Swiss, and also of the great improvement in the machinery for such labor now in vogue. Millions were sunk in the St. Gothard tunnel in gaining this

knowledge, which is now, of course, at the command of the French engineers. The commission appointed to examine the matter report that they find easy grades, and recommend a tunnel longer than any yet constructed, and with a single track. The St. Gothard cost nine years of labor; it is estimated that the Simplon will be constructed in six.

A RUSSIAN EXPLORER is trying his hand in New Guinea, and thinks he finds reasons for claiming for his country a portion of the north-eastern coast in partnership with the German Empire. He describes a portion of the coast as containing immense forests, comparable only to those of Central America for the size and height of the trees. The inhabitants are still in the stone age, and they keep their prisoners of war as slaves, if no worse fate befalls them. The shells which he took with him as currency were not acceptable to the Papuans, and he thus came near starving, with his suite, until he bethought himself of turning doctor for the tribe. The effect of his medicine covered him with glory, and they soon acquired a great respect for the brave explorer.

He remained with them, married a wife to satisfy them, and became a magisterial authority among them. His wedding was a festival on a scale so grand and fantastic that he thought himself playing a part in the grand opera of Paris. But a Russian vessel was sent after six years to seek, and, fortunately, to find him. He returned, and now offers his country the chance of a protectorate over the land thus gained.

THE JESUITS are slowly but surely making their way back into Germany. Several members of prominent noble families have recently entered the order, and one of these families has been in the lead in the great *Kulturkampf* that now seems about closing. In addition to these, several princely families are named that have gone over to the enemy in the hope of thus receiving a support for the waning aristocracy. One reason for this may be found in the fact that nearly all distinguished Catholic families are having their children educated in the institutions of the Jesuits. Another set of German nobles are sending their children to French or Belgian Jesuit colleges. This is certainly a very strange proceeding, and a novel way of subverting that law of the empire which forbids the Jesuits from acting as teachers to German youth. It is virtually treason to the country.

THE BELGIAN MONARCH seems, better than some others, to understand the situation as to the working-classes, for he addresses them virtually from the throne, thus showing his appreciation of their sorrows. He believes their condition in his country worthy of much sympathy, and presses on his legislators and magistrates increased attention to their petitions and their wants. He declares it but just and wise to give especial care and protection to the weak and the unfortunate. This opens the way to the true principle of modern social reform; namely, a just and sacred regard for all classes. The king's programme is: Improvement of the relations between employer and employed by the establishing of courts of

arbitration to settle disputed questions ; regulation of the hours and conditions of labor of women and children ; better pay, better homes and schools, and thus on through the list of evils.

HOLLAND'S MINISTER OF JUSTICE has just laid before the Chambers a bill for the furtherance of Sabbath observance. According to this all work outside of the house, and even inside in case it can be heard in the street, is forbidden on the Sabbath. No public sales or auctions will be allowed, except for the necessities of ordinary life. Further, it is prohibited on Sundays, before eight o'clock in the evening, to arrange any public amusements, and on Sundays to sell any intoxicating liquors before noon. In explanation the minister says : "A complete prohibition of Sunday labor is now not practicable, but the government desires to do its best toward the realization of this aim." He thinks, also, that stricter regulations regarding Sunday amusements would not now be practicable. •We simply wonder that he ventures to ask so much.

THE SWISS FEDERAL COUNCIL seems inclined to be very active in the work of moral reform. It has just placed a pretty heavy tax on the production and sale of ardent spirits. The main idea seems to be a good income from high license, and a tax on home and foreign production in this line. In the cantons of Schaffhausen and Berne the apothecaries are following the example of their colleagues in Basel, namely, that of closing their stores in turn on Sundays and holidays. The Common Council of St. Gall have rejected a petition requesting that the stores might be open on Sundays, and the Reformed Protestant ministers of the same canton are recommending more ornamentation in the churches in order to make them more attractive. In this line a Protestant professor has delivered a course of lectures advocating the adoption by Protestantism of the *Madonna* as a symbol of family purity. This is simply queer.

THE BALTIC PROVINCES still continue to feel the iron heel of Russia in relation to all that concerns their churches and schools. The Orthodox Greek Church is determined that the Lutherans shall yield, and virtually abandon their Church. When they decline to do this they are treated as rebels and surrounded with spies. The very servants in their households are often paid to act as informers. If these people report that their employers have spoken disrespectfully of the emperor or the Russian Church, a sentinel is put before their doors and they are summoned before a civil court. The Russo-Greek Church makes its propaganda in the most shameless way. The simple peasants of the country are promised land without payment and a church without tithes if they will come over and be converted, and such offers are very tempting to the poor and ignorant peasantry. This promise is a falsehood ; and when, too late, they learn this, and complain, they are persecuted as disloyal to the national Church.

MISSIONARY INTELLIGENCE.

PROGRESS IN CHINA.—It is now about eighty years since the first missionary work was begun in China. The London Missionary Society sent out Morrison in 1807, but it was seven years before a single convert was secured. China was not then open to the Gospel, and it was only in a very limited and cautious way that Morrison could work at all. After the war of 1842, Hong Kong, which was ceded to England, and five ports were opened to foreigners. In 1860 missionaries were allowed to travel throughout the empire, and other cities were designated as free to foreigners for residence. From that time on, the missionaries have been gradually gaining liberties and opportunities, until now the whole of China is open to missionary effort. China has proved to be a hard field; but there are indications that the stubborn opposition of the people to the introduction and spread of the Gospel is almost ready to break down. Most of the difficulties have been fomented by the *literati* class, who rouse the rabble and precipitate conflicts, and themselves remain in the background. Protestant missions are being gradually extended into western and south-western China, and by the end of the present century every province will probably have mission centers. The territory and the population are, however, so vast that it must be many years before the empire is occupied in any real sense by Christian missions. From this time forth the Chinese themselves must take a more and more prominent part in the evangelization of the millions upon millions of their countrymen.

The growth of missions in China since the Shanghai Conference of 1877 has been very encouraging. It has, in fact, been as large in the past nine years as in the previous twenty-four years. In 1843 there were only six Protestant converts, so that all that were reported in 1877 were really gained in that period. The total of communicants in 1877 was 13,515, which was regarded at that time, taking every thing into consideration, as an encouraging exhibit. It indicated an average gain of 563 converts a year, or a fraction under 11 a week. According to a table compiled by Dr. Luther H. Gulick, editor of the *Chinese Recorder*, from reports received up to December 31 of last year, there are now 28,119. Some reports were, however, not complete, and it is his belief that the actual strength of Protestant Christianity in China cannot fall below 30,000. But taking the smaller number we find that the 13,515 of 1877 has considerably more than doubled in the nine years that have elapsed. The net gain is 14,604, which gives an average of 1,623 a year, or 31 a week. It may seem a small result in proportion to the labor and money expended; a "thin harvest," as our English paper in Shanghai calls it, but it is not so when the obstacles are properly estimated; it is not so when the difficulties which have been overcome are considered; it is not so when the character of the influence missions are now exerting in China is taken into account. A converted Chinaman is a

more positive force to-day than he was nine years ago, and the prospects of the coming nine years are surely much brighter than they were in 1877 of the past nine years. For an example of improved prospects, take the present attitude of the Government as indicated in the proclamations issued in the provinces last October. These proclamations were issued in response to directions from Peking, and express the will of the imperial Government, with the object of allaying the hostility of the people toward the "Jesus religion," and softening their prejudices, and of affording the fullest protection to the missionaries. The people are told that the Christian religion teaches them to do right, and ought therefore to be respected. The governor of the district which includes Shanghai begins his official notification by explaining that under the treaties missionaries have the right to lease ground and houses, and to travel about to preach, "*their sole aim being the inculcation of the practice of virtue, and having no design of interfering with the business of the people.*" Such of the subjects of China as wish to become converts may lawfully do so, and so long as they abstain from evil-doing there is no law prescribing inquisition into or prohibition of their action." A recent outbreak, resulting in the destruction of churches and chapels, is then referred to, and summary vengeance, it is stated, will be taken on the ringleaders, "for the consequences of such misdoings are manifold and far-reaching." The proclamation continues as follow:

I have accordingly ordered all officials in every jurisdiction to act in strict compliance with the Imperial will, and it is now my duty to issue this urgent proclamation for the information of all persons in the circuit of which I am Intendant. Bear in mind that when missionaries live in the midst of your villages you and they are mutually in the relationship of host and guest. Under ordinary circumstances it is your foremost duty to act toward them with courtesy and forbearance. More is involved than the mere protecting of missionary chapels; the weal and woe of yourselves, your homes, and your livelihood are assuredly concerned. Let such of you as are fathers and brothers do your utmost to teach the necessity of turning away wrath and putting an end to strife. Cast your eyes ever on the warning example which has preceded, and avoid a day of repentance in the future. This is my earnest wish. Do not disobey this urgent and special proclamation.

When did Chinese governors ever before speak in such appreciative terms of Christianity? What will be the influence of these proclamations on the people to whom they are addressed? Will they not have great effect in removing popular delusions and prejudices respecting Christianity? It must be remembered that no special pressure was exerted on the Chinese Government by other nations to induce it to take this action. It was a voluntary proceeding, and shows, whatever the motive inspiring it may be, the desire of the Government that missionaries shall in no way be hindered in their work. "Those who embrace Christianity," says the governor of the province of Cheh Kiang, "do not cease to be Chinese." This is what he calls putting "the matter plainly." Such official utterances show that Christianity has at last won the respect, if not the confidence, of Chinese rulers, and will henceforth meet with fewer obstacles.

Taking up Dr. Gulick's statistics again, we find much to encourage in them. They show that eight more societies and nearly twice as many

missionaries are at work as in 1877. The figures respecting native preachers and contributions are, unfortunately, very defective. But it is not a matter of dispute that there has been a great gain in these respects. We give two of Dr. Gulick's tables in one:

NAME OF SOCIETY.	Foreign Missionaries.					Native Ordained Ministers.	Unordained Native Helpers.	Communicants.	Pupils in Schools.	Contributions by Native Churches.
	Date of Mission.	Mén.	Wives.	Singls Women.	Total.					
1 London Missionary Soc...	1807	24	17	6	47	8	66	3,052	1,711	\$5,000 00
2 A. B. C. F. M.	1830	26	25	12	63	..	80	1,175
3 American Baptist, North..	1834	9	9	5	23	8	72	1,433	175	491 26
4 American Protestant Epis.	1835	11	9	3	23	17	13	384	801	500 80
5 American Pres., North....	1838	44	32	14	90	14	16	4,368	1,804	1,472 00
6 British and For. Bible Soc.	1843	11	5	..	16	..	82
7 Church Mission Society...	1844	24	23	..	47	4	186	2,724	1,089	2,108 00
8 English Baptist.....	1845	15	14	1	30	..	17	994	46
9 Methodist Episcopal.....	1847	24	24	12	60	(?) 68	136	2,408	988	3,121 10
10 Seventh Day Baptist.....	1847	1	1	1	3	..	8	18	69	88 00
11 American Baptist, South..	1847	11	9	4	24	547	600 00
12 Basel Mission.....	1847	19	19	..	3	4	49	1,611	461
13 English Presbyterian.....	1847	22	17	7	4	5	121	3,312	1,524 74
14 Rhenish Mission.....	1847	3	3	..	6	..	6	60	200
15 Meth. Episcopal, South..	1848	8	8	7	23	3	7	146	653	222 11
16 Berlin Foundling Hospital.	1850	1	1	4	6	80
17 Wesleyan Mission Society.	1852	20	8	4	32	..	28	679	587
18 Am. Reformed (Dutch)....	1858	5	5	2	12	(?) 3	20	784	2,008 43
19 Woman's Union Mission..	1859	8	3
20 Meth. New Connection....	1860	6	5	..	11	..	54	1,186	142
21 Soc. Promotion Fem. Edu.	1860	3	3
22 United Presbyterian, Scot.	1864	7	6	..	13	..	17	306
23 China Inland Mission.....	1865	92	40	55	187	..	114	1,314	274	408 13
24 National Bible Soc. Scot..	1868	3	2	..	5
25 United Meth. Free Church.	1868	3	3	..	6	..	10	297	..	300 00
26 Am. Presbyterian, South..	1868	8	6	4	18	..	10	44	207	35 00
27 Irish Presbyterian.....	1869	3	3	..	6
28 Canadian Presbyterian....	1871	2	2	..	4	..	32	1,128	55
29 Soc. Propagation Gospel..	1874	4	2	..	6
30 American Bible Society....	1876	8	4	..	12	..	40
31 Established Church Scot..	1878	2	2	..	4	..	3	30	438
32 Berlin Mission.....	1882	5	5	..	10	..	27	119	84
33 Gen. Prot. Evang. Society.	1884	1	1
34 Bible Christians.....	1885	2	2
35 Disciples of Christ.....	1886	3	3
36 Book and Tract Society....	1886	1	1
37 Society of Friends.....	1886	1	1	1	3
38 Independent Workers.....	1886	3	..	2	5
Total.....		432	310	150	892	134	1,114	28,119	9,864	\$17,874 57

The total of missionaries in 1877 was 473, of whom 238 were men, 172 married women, 63 single women. These numbers have been doubled, nearly since 1877. The China Inland Mission has the largest number of workers—187; the American Presbyterian Mission, North, comes next, with 90 missionaries; then the American Board with 63; and then our own Church with 60. The China Inland Mission had only 54 missionaries in 1877, and was second in the list, the American Presbyterian, North, being first, with 59. The American Board has added only 13 to its force. Of the whole number of missionaries 650 have entered the field in the

last decade. The oldest in the field is Dr. Hopper, his term of service extending over 43 years.

Allowing China a population of 350,000,000, we have at present one missionary, including women, to every 389,000 Chinese. What is this handful of workers to the work? The great hope for China lies in the development of the native ministry. We wish there were at hand complete statistics of the strength of this arm of the service.

PROGRESS IN INDIA.—The Gospel has had one great difficulty to contend against in India that it has not encountered in China—the evil of caste. Caste is the most monstrous system ever invented in the interest of the devil's kingdom. It holds India in fearful bondage, and it will require centuries after its power shall have been broken to efface the stamp it has set upon the people. When its sway shall cease nobody can predict. Of course it cannot be in this century; perhaps not in the next. It is being gradually undermined by various causes, the Gospel being, of course, the most potent. As Christianity takes root and spreads caste loses in power, and becomes modified; but its day of doom does not appear to be near at hand. Considering how stringently its lines are drawn it is a wonder that Christianity has made such headway in a century. It is to be remembered, however, that it is the lower castes and outcasts that have been reached principally, although some impression has been made on the higher castes. The sacred sign of Siva has been washed from the forehead of the Brahman, in not a few cases, by the water of Christian baptism, and the sacred thread has been laid aside for the ministerial robe. There is, indeed, a large Christian constituency in India compared with that of China. India has been open much longer to the preaching of the Gospel than China, and Christian influences are vastly stronger than in the more northern empire. It is now ninety-five years since Carey inaugurated modern missionary work in India, and a vast amount of missionary effort has been put forth.

The increase of communicants, it will be observed, averages over 6,000 a year, and yet the number of missionaries is smaller by a hundred than is reported for China. There is a large gain in native ministers, one fourth of the whole number of whom are connected with the Church Missionary Society. Our own Church, which is third in the list of missionary agents, is seventh in that of ordained native preachers, and sixth in that of communicants. Our missions have gained heavily, however, since this table was made up. In North India alone the increase of communicants last year was about a thousand. The accessions of adult Hindus amounted to 1,324, besides 30 Moslems and 29 others. The increase in native ordained ministers for the four years is distributed as follows: Church Missionary, 22; Methodist Episcopal, 19; Gospel Propagation Society, 14; Gossner's Lutheran Mission, 9; London Missionary Society, 7; American Board, 7. In the Church of England missions the native agents outnumber the regular missionaries. The increase of native Christians may be divided as follows:

Gospel Propagation Society.....	10,076
American Baptist Missionary Union.....	7,430
Canadian Baptist Mission.....	2,682
American United Presbyterian Mission.....	2,585
Church Missionary Society.....	2,340
Methodist Episcopal.....	1,550
Leipzig Lutheran Mission.....	1,517
German Evangelical Mission (U.S.A.).....	1,271

The American Baptists report the largest gain in native communicants, 5,618; next comes the Methodist Episcopal Church, with 2,397; Gospel Propagation Society, 2,338; Church Missionary, 2,218; American Evangelical Lutheran Mission, 1,179; American United Presbyterian Mission, 1,778; German Evang. Lutheran Mission, 1,500; Gossner's Mission, 1,319.

The results of missionary labor in India appear from time to time in statistical tables, the latest of which are due to one of our own missionaries, the Rev. B. H. Badley, whose *Indian Missionary Directory*, first published in 1876, again in 1881, and the third time in 1885, is a valuable depository of figures and facts. The following table, compiled by him for 1885, deserves a careful study:

NAMES OF SOCIETIES AND MISSIONS.	Began work in India.	Foreign Missionaries.	Native Ordain'd Agents.	Native Christians.	Communicants.
1 Baptist Missionary Society.....	1793	43	50	10,000	4,000
2 London Missionary Society.....	1798	47	44	55,029	6,221
3 American Board.....	1813	24	37	14,475	4,626
4 Church Missionary Society.....	1814	115	132	101,333	23,289
5 Gospel Propagation Society.....	1817	53	71	90,888	21,996
6 Wesleyan Missionary Society.....	1817	44	9	4,200	1,800
7 General Baptist Missionary Society.....	1822	8	9	3,393	1,259
8 Church of Scotland Mission.....	1828	17	3	1,306	396
9 Free Church of Scotland Mission.....	1828	32	10	1,591	1,527
10 American Presbyterian Mission.....	1834	36	12	1,743	1,000
11 Basel Missionary Society.....	1834	79	10	8,513	4,445
12 American Baptist Missionary Union.....	1836	27	55	64,500	23,127
13 American Free Baptist Mission.....	1836	6	4	1,085	558
14 Gossner's Missionary Society.....	1840	17	11	32,000	12,181
15 Leipzig Missionary Society.....	1841	25	12	13,589	4,130
16 Irish Presbyterian Mission.....	1841	10	..	1,418	302
17 Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Mission.....	1841	8	..	3,719	852
18 American Evangelical Lutheran Mission.....	1842	10	4	9,360	3,842
19 American Reformed Mission.....	1853	8	4	5,437	1,610
20 Moravian Mission.....	1854	3	..	36	11
21 American United Presbyterian Mission.....	1855	8	3	3,245	2,176
22 Methodist Episcopal Church Mission.....	1856	72	36	8,604	5,486
23 United Presbyterian (Scotland) Mission.....	1860	16	1	960	441
24 Danish Lutheran Mission.....	1861	6	..	481	80
25 Presbyterian Church of England Mission.....	1862	1	..	34	15
26 Hermannsburg Lutheran Mission.....	1866	11	..	800	300
27 Friends' For. Miss. Association Mission.....	1866	3	..	86	18
28 Indian Home Mission.....	1867	5	5	4,273	3,500
29 Canadian Baptist Mission.....	1868	9	3	4,500	1,870
30 German Evangelical Mission (U. S. A.).....	1869	4	..	530	234
31 Scotch Episcopal Church Mission.....	1870	..	1	28	8
32 Original Sect'n Church of Scotland Miss.....	1872	1	..	53	6
33 Canadian Presbyterian Mission.....	1877	5	..	126	72
34 Swedish Evangelical Mission.....	1877	8	..	34	16
35 American Free Methodist Mission.....	1880	1
36 Disciples of Christ Mission.....	1883	3	..	8	8
Private and Other Missions.....	26	4	2,421	1,152
Total.....		791	530	449,755	137,504
Increase since 1881.....		133	69	32,333	24,179

ROMAN CATHOLIC MISSIONS IN ASIA.—Protestant missions in India and China make a small showing, so far as statistics are concerned, in comparison with those of the Church of Rome. But it must be remembered that a "convert" to Catholicism does not mean what a "convert" to Protestantism means. It is possible to be a Catholic and still be largely heathen. The head, whether of infant or adult, that has received the water of baptism in the name of the Trinity is a Christian according to the Catholic idea. The large figures given for Catholic dioceses or vicariates in India and China and Indo-China must, therefore, be taken with due allowance. India, according to the latest statistics, (*Catholic Missions*; December, 1886), is divided into nineteen vicariates apostolic and two prefectures apostolic. In these twenty-one ecclesiastical divisions there are reported 1,185,538 Catholics, out of a total population of 253,907,500. For the spiritual care of these Catholics there are 1,089 priests, of whom over a hundred are natives. Of churches and chapels there are 2,687, of schools and colleges, 1,591, and of scholars, 66,941. There are also 16 seminaries and 872 seminarists, most of whom we may suppose expect to qualify for the priesthood. Of these seminarists 480 are in a single vicariate, that of Pondicherry, which is the second largest vicariate in India in point of Catholic population, reporting 199,396, with 5,000 scholars in the schools. There are 80 European missionaries and 30 native priests in this vicariate, or rather in the vicariate and prefecture which bear the same name. The largest vicariate is that of Verapoli, which has 280,600 Catholics out of 2,671,000 population. In China there are 26 vicariates and 2 prefectures, and a total of 483,403 Catholics. The table gives the population of the empire at 390,000,000, which is probably too high by 40,000,000. There are 47 European missionaries, 281 native priests, 2,429 churches and chapels (almost as many as in India), 1,779 schools and colleges (nearly 200 more than in India), and 25,219 scholars. The seminaries number 33, against 16 in India, with 654 seminarists. The largest number of Catholics are reported from the vicariate of Nanking, 101,000, which is occupied solely by missionaries of the Jesuit order. In the three vicariates in the province of Pecheli, there are 82,500 Catholics; in Szechuen about the same number also in three vicariates. Four vicariates in Mongolia and Manchuria and one in Korea are not included in the statistics for China. There are in the four vicariates about 32,000 Catholics, in Korea 13,642, in Japan, two vicariates, upward of 30,000. Thibet appears in this group with 1,000 Catholics. The group in south-eastern Asia includes 14 vicariates, with 280 missionaries, 373 native priests, 1,950 churches and chapels, 1,028 schools and colleges, 19,399 scholars, and 16 seminaries, with 1,042 seminarists, and 694,286 Catholics in a population of 44,444,488. The grand total for these countries of Asia is 2,639 European and native priests, 7,293 churches and chapels, 4,469 schools and colleges, 112,359 scholars, 71 seminaries, with 2,746 seminarists and 2,440,481 Catholics in a total population of 745,351,988, or fully half the population of the earth. Of the European missionaries, 671 are sent out by the Paris Society of Foreign Missions, 287 are Jesuits, 62 are Capuchins, 300

Carmelites, 45 Lazarists, 60 Oblates, 42 Dominicans, 16 Benedictines, and 4 Augustinians.

THE TONGAN DIFFICULTIES are increasing rather than diminishing. Our readers will remember the account we gave of the division in the Wesleyan forces. Two or three missionaries poisoned the mind of the king against the Superintendent and planned a secession, forming substantially a State Church and using outrageous methods to induce the ministers and churches to join their party. Persecution has been pretty constantly exercised in the name of the king against all those who preferred to adhere to the Australasian Wesleyan Society, and the shallowest pretexts have served as the ground of criminal or treasonable accusation. Recently Joel Nan, a native minister, was prosecuted for having said that he had been informed that under certain circumstances Mr. Watkins would leave the Free Church, the name which the seceders adopted. For this offense he was sentenced to imprisonment for two years and to pay a fine of one hundred dollars. As soon as this charge was disposed of another was presented. Nan was charged with having said that, like Paul, he obeyed his king in earthly matters, but not in spiritual. This was construed as intimating that King George was a Nero, and Nan was sentenced to another period of five years hard labor and to pay a fine. A third charge, of having said that the king erred, was brought, and another five years of sentence added, making twelve in all, with several hundred dollars in fines. As Nan is a man fifty years old he can hardly hope to live to serve out his sentences. He is said to have proved himself to be a worthy minister and to have done excellent work in the Fiji Islands. Everywhere native ministers and members are summoned to court on trivial charges, and fined and imprisoned. In many cases they have chosen rather to go to prison than to burden their churches with the payment of their fines. The native ministers and their families on one of the islands were compelled to remove on twenty-four hours' notice to another island, leaving all their property behind them. All these acts are said to be instigated or approved by Mr. Baker, formerly a Wesleyan minister. The stories told of the high-handed proceedings of Messrs. Baker and Watkins in the name of the king seem almost incredible, but they are well vouched for. The Anglican Bishop of Nelson was so impressed by what he saw in Tonga during a visit that he moved his synod to protest against the "very stringent and severe measures put in force by the Tongan Government against a minority, whereby the great principles of religious toleration and freedom are violated." It would seem to be a good case for the interference of the British Government. Mwanga of Uganda is not more regardless of justice and humanity than these ex-Wesleyan dictators.

THE MARTYRDOM OF BISHOP HANNINGTON continues to excite a lively interest among all classes of English Christians, as is evinced by the publication of a Sketch of his Life and Works in London, a notice of which, in the *Contemporary Review*, characterizes the deceased bishop as

"one of the best types of English manhood—practical, resolute, single-minded, hearty, and resourceful, rising vigorously to difficulty and danger, and sustained by a strong and straightforward religious faith."

GREAT INTEREST is also felt in the fate of the solitary missionary of the Church Society in Uganda—Mr. Mackay. The Rev. R. P. Ashe, his companion, whom Mwanga permitted to leave, has been in London some months, making speeches in the interest of missions and conferring with officers of the society concerning the policy to be pursued in Uganda. The latest news from Mr. Mackay shows that he is well and has not lost courage, but is anxious that large things shall be devised for the mission. He is visited by inquirers under cover of darkness, and is doing what he can under the most adverse circumstances to win converts from heathenism. The visit of Stanley, on his way to relieve Emin Bey, may, if it be not too late, result in saving Mr. Mackay from an awkward fate, and in securing toleration for the mission. It seems that over two hundred conversions have resulted from the labors of the missionaries, and the mission has a long roll of martyrs.

THE MAGAZINES AND REVIEWS.

THE question of the disestablishment of the English Church, like that of Home Rule, is one that will not down. Welsh disestablishment has been inevitable since tardy justice was done to Ireland by removing the legal supremacy of the Irish Church. In several parts of the British Isles the cry goes up, "Relieve us from the burdens and predominance of an unwelcome Church." In Wales, where the Welsh Calvinists form the largest denomination, and an immense majority of the people do not belong to the Established Church, the cry, just at present, is loudest. In the *Contemporary Review* for December, Stuart Rendel, M.P., shows that the Welsh perceive that just as in the past England used the English Establishment for purely English purposes in Wales, so many Englishmen decline to withdraw the Establishment lest English interests should suffer in England also. It is not to the Church as a Church that they object, but to the Church as an Establishment. If the English Church were a voluntary body, it would be regarded as a valuable fellow-worker in the Welsh vineyard. Welsh non-conformity sprang from the bosom of their Church. It was not dissent, it was evangelization. The English Church is rejected as English, as Episcopalian, and as Established. It can be truly said that the history of the English Church in Wales shows the same degree of wrong, except in quantity, as in Ireland. At the time of the English Reformation the Latin ritual was displaced for the English tongue—not for the Welsh. The Welsh gentry being, in 1745, Jacobite, English statesmen used the Church as an Anglicizing and denationalizing organization. From 1845 to 1870 not a single Welshman filled a Welsh see in the Established Church.

As bishops in Wales appoint the deans and hold the bulk of the patronage, English bishops in Wales made English deans and English clergy. This, of course, emptied their churches of all Welsh-speaking people. Then when the churches were emptied followed nepotism, pluralism, and absenteeism, until the buildings fell into ruin. As late as 1830 in one Welsh see three quarters of the whole endowment of the diocese went to members of the bishop's family and absentees. Religion was saved in Wales only by the humble evangelists who began in the seventeenth century, and who have wrought so well that they have built three thousand chapels and have a voluntary income of \$2,000,000 a year. It is evident, therefore, that the Establishment drives a hard and cruel wedge into the midst of a friendly and trustful people, splitting it asunder just where class, religion, and politics furnish so unhappily a common line of cleavage. Another very great injustice is, that while the Anglican Church is the Church of a ridiculously small minority she has practically the use of all the old educational endowments in Wales. If any are disposed to look upon the continuance of the English Establishment as in any degree an act of security, they have but to read to correct their view, the many additional points of unhappy contact set forth in this article. Political sentiment in Wales is rapidly approaching a point where the Liberal party will very soon be compelled to be Welsh first and English afterward. This will bring another difficult question, in addition to the Irish, before Parliament, and as the Welsh are intensely Protestant and non-conformist, they will make themselves heard more quickly than Catholic Ireland.

Canon Westcott has a most scholarly and broad paper in this number on "Christianity as the Absolute Religion." The object of the Gospel is stated to be to reach all men, all time; all creation; to effect the perfection as well as the redemption of finite beings; to bring about a perfect unity of humanity without destroying the personality of any one man. It claims to deal with all that is external as well as all that is internal; with matter as well as with spirit; with the physical universe as well as with the moral universe; to realize a re-creation co-existing with creation; to present Him who is the Maker of the world as the heir of all things; to complete the cycle of existence, and to show how all things come from God and go to God. The incarnation and the resurrection furnish the basis for a religion which is intensely human, and which at every moment introduces the infinite and the unseen into a vital connection with the things of earth. Without the Gospel, men, as Dr. Newman once impressively said, look upon the face of nature for tokens of the presence of God, and it is "as if I looked in a mirror and saw no reflection but my own face." But Christ justifies our highest hope, opening depths of vision below the surface of things, transforming suffering, showing us the highest aspirations of our being, satisfied through a way of sorrow; disclosing the supernatural qualities of life by revealing its external glory; enabling us to understand how, being what we are, every grief and every strain of sensibility can be made in him tributary to the working out of our common destiny. As to the objection to the claims of Christianity

that they are paralleled by the claims of other religions, and that they are disproved by the crimes of Christians, Canon Westcott remarks, If it could be shown that the vital force of any other great religion was alien to Christianity—if it could be shown that the crimes of Christians arose from that which is the essence of their faith—then the objections would be weighty; but if, on the other hand, it is obvious that the other religions of the world each touch the hearts of men by a power of ardor of devotion, of a sympathy with nature, or of surrender to a supreme king, then each pre-Christian religion becomes a witness to the faith which combines with manifold powers in a final unity. The wickednesses of Christian men and Christian states are obviously in defiance of the message of the incarnation; and only prove that the approach to the ideal is slow, and that the ideal arises above attainment to condemn and to encourage.

The work of Bishop Taylor makes every article on the exploration and religious condition of Africa interesting to Methodists. Joseph Thompson has a study in this number on the present condition and prospects of Mohammedanism in Central Africa. The writer issues a warning voice against the misapprehension of Mohammedanism which is very much of the same kind as that against which Canon Westcott inveighs in the article from which we have quoted. Very few know that Mohammed said, that the worst of men was the man who sold men. The writer holds that the Mohammedan has as much right to lay our brutal slave-trade and our incessant wars, and all the crying evils of the gin-trade, to the teaching of Christianity, as we have to say that the slave-trade is produced and encouraged by Islam. The author has conducted three expeditions in East Central Africa, but saw nothing in these expeditions which suggested Mohammedanism as a civilizing power. There were no missionaries to preach Islam. Five hundred years of contact on the part of the tribes adjacent to Muscat had left the blacks without any reflection of the higher traits which characterize their neighbors, and this has been equally true, in his judgment, of Christian efforts, at which he ceased to wonder when he saw how the missionaries attempted the impracticable, expecting to do in a generation the work of centuries, and to instill the highest conceptions of religion into undeveloped brains. Last year the writer was converted from this skepticism in West Central Africa. Yet, notwithstanding his conversion, he declares there is no shirking the naked reality that in West Africa our influence for evil enormously counter-balances, thus far, any little good we have produced. His conversion took place when passing up the Niger through the degraded cannibals who inhabit its lower reaches. He found undoubted Negroes very different from the naked barbarians he had previously seen. He saw cities of ten thousand to thirty thousand inhabitants, well clothed, self-possessed, dignified men, an industrious community; no native beer or spirits, no European gin and rum found place in their markets. Outside the towns no forest covered the land. Agriculture was the habit of the people. Contact with Europeans had had nothing to do with it. This was almost exclu-

sively, in the view of the author, due to Mohammedanism. Mohammedanism supplied the tie which bound one hundred families together. The Koran supplied a new code of laws, swept away fetichism, nature-worship, and made the people reverent worshipers of the one God. While retaining polygamy, the Soudanese do not seclude their wives in harems nor compel them to be veiled. In this part of Africa Mohammedan missionary work is very intense and active. It is, then, strange to say, in the success of Mohammedanism that this writer finds the prophecy of Christian success, holding that it contains as much of good as the Negro can well assimilate. Mohammedanism has succeeded because it has asked of the Negro apparently so little, and yet in that little lie the germs of a great revolution. The Negro is able to comprehend a very terrible one God who sits in judgment with rewards for the good and punishment for the wicked; belief in these, in God's messenger, and devotion to a few duties. Because of its inferiority as compared with Christianity, he holds that it has succeeded. As to missionary work, the author strongly recognizes a similar policy on the part of Christian missionaries.

Our readers will not forget that Bishop Colenso once advocated missionary advance by concessions to heathen prejudice, especially with regard to polygamy. We know of no nation that has been Christianized by concession. The whole history of the Church shows the best results secured by the teaching of Christian morals, by requiring, as strictly as possible, an obedience to its moral law, and by teaching the doctrines of Christianity in their higher, more spiritual phases as rapidly as experience and mental development permitted. There is no question, and the Roman Church in some of its fields has given examples of this, that the adoption of well-known practices into the Roman ritual may give an external aspect of conquest which is very seductive. But that which is received is quite as likely to be as permanent a force of corruption as that which is given; hence the slow moral progress of many of the nations and peoples which have been Christianized according to the Roman idea. Mohammedanism, younger than Christianity, is no preparation for Christianity. Allying itself, as it does every-where, with the polygamous tendencies of mankind, it breaks up the ideal of the Christian family, degrades womanhood, and smothers religion. In India, Mohammedanism is the bitterest foe of Christianity, even while it admits the beauty of the Christian teaching and character. Mohammedanism succeeds because it lays few burdens of restraint upon the worst passions of humanity; Christianity grows slowly in contact with Mohammedanism and heathenism, because it demands self-mastery at the beginning. The experience of the Protestant Christian every-where shows, that when once the idea of a divine Saviour enters the mind that is already seeking, it relieves it from sin; astonishing results in intellectual stimulus and moral sobriety constantly appear, compelling those who observe these results to feel that the elevating influence of the Gospel is the same to-day as when it was preached by the apostles and spread among idolaters of the lowest kind in every nation; and it will not be found that the great apostle to the Gentiles preached a

modified Gospel, with accommodations to the low state of morals, in order to win his converts.

The January number of this same Review appears in a much more attractive form than the older and thicker issue, with smaller pages. The Earl of Selborne opens this number with "Thoughts About Party," which, while dealing with the English system, has many relations to our own. It would appear from this paper that the English system is slowly giving way to the American; which, while not especially alluded to, is yet portrayed in the words that the old liberal idea would remove the center of gravity from Parliament to a federation of delegates from political unions, which would limit the choice of electors to persons who had first approved themselves to the managers of an inner conclave, holding the leading party in leading strings, transforming Ministers of State into dictators, by enabling them, through these agencies, to ostracize all who do not obey the party leader. This is evidently a close description of what we have here; but the writer declares that party government will soon cease to be tolerable if it cannot be emancipated from this slavery. That a machinery should exist by which a party, without change of name, by reason of the subjection of local majorities to that machinery, should be liable to have its character and objects transformed into something different from what they were understood to be before is something intolerable. Men of independent minds are compelled to remember thus, that there are duties and obligations paramount to those of party association.

Referring to a paper on "The Higher Education of Women," Helen M. Kirle writes in this number of "The Lower Education of Women." That article held that a highly educated woman was incapacitated for her natural functions. She is a woman destroyed and a man not made. The writer holds that underneath all such opinion there is the notion that there is but one sphere for woman's thought, work, and action, and that sphere is only that of wife, mother, and household drudge. The education which is given with this end in view, according to the writer, has not tended to elevate the mental and moral strength of woman. There are a great many lamentations, she says, about constitutions ruined by exertion in study, but where are the lamentations about over-dressed, over-danced girls, over-driven girls, over-dissipated girls? What of mornings begun at mid-day; afternoons harassed in getting through in one day a week's social duty; of days spent in railway traveling for two days' giddy visit to a fashionable house? The old notion seems to be, that a present generation of one sex is to be sacrificed for a future generation of the other. To set out to make a good wife or a good mother, without making first a good woman, is folly. This is a very sharp paper, with a little tinge of the bitterness to which we have been accustomed from the woman's rights advocates in favor of free suffrage in America; but the literary tone is vastly higher, and the argument in favor of the best education for women unusually clearly stated and enforced.

The advantage of an alliterative title is seldom better shown than in the article by Sir Wilfred Lawson, in the *Nineteenth Century*, in the title,

"The Classes, the Masses, and the Glasses," being a strong paper in favor of total abstinence as a cure for many of the evils of English society. He touches the root of the whole matter in the question, Is it not a little selfish to resist a reform which aims to benefit the whole public through fear of some slight personal inconvenience? English society is certainly coming to see, as we see here, that the public-house or saloon is the hot-bed of crime and pauperism. This article shows that in England, as here, the liquor interests are a tremendous political power banded together, acting intelligently and unitedly. The private interests thus are made to stand against public rights, money against men, the gains of the few against the lives of the many. It is the enormous influence of the liquor trade in England which has prevented the right of local self-government with regard to the liquor traffic, as it has prevented it in many parts of the United States; and he puts a strong argument in the mouths of the American Prohibitionists, when he makes the statement that if any body has a scheme to suggest that has not been tried and failed, this is the time to produce it. Lord Brassey has a very pleasant and appreciative article on "A Flying Visit to the United States." England seems to be passing through the same change in respect to the character of her seamen that America has undergone. The old English and American sailor element, thrifty and intelligent, and well educated in duties of sea-faring life, is passing away, giving place to Scandinavians of another type. With the wages of seamen as they are at present, one who would equal the income of a blacksmith or a carpenter must become an officer. But this is not true in the engine-room. The engineers are mostly Scotch, and the stokers Irish. This last is the most dreadful employment in the world. The stoker, black with coal-dust, has to work in a temperature of 130 degrees Fahr., and shovel every day five tons of coal into the furnaces, and keep the fires clear and bright by constant raking and the removal of ashes. It seems strange that so intelligent a man as Lord Brassey should speak of the Garden Battery, thus confounding Castle Garden with the Battery. He speaks of the destruction of the architectural beauty of the city by the great masts of the telegraph and telephone companies, and states that the elevated railway system is vastly better than the underground, and not objectionable from an æsthetic point of view. The relations between labor and capital in America, he holds, call for self-denial not less than in the countries of the Old World. Chicago fills him with astonishment, but is not, in his judgment, an attractive city. The city of Pullman is altogether too patriarchal, in his judgment—minuteness of regulation having been carried too far, and not sufficient scope given for individual liberty. His words are only too true with regard to the wickedness of recklessly wasting timber. The author is not in sympathy with the prevalent English impression, that there is more sharp practice in business in the United States than in other countries. Life in America differs, in the judgment of Lord Brassey, where it differs at all from the best in England, only in being more vivacious and less ceremonious. The mass of the people in the United States are in a condition superior to that attained in the most

fortunate countries of the Old World. The political institutions of the United States have the greater merit of not having presented obstructions to the material progress of the people; they have facilitated the progress of the country in civilization and wealth. Measured by political results the constitution of the United States has been eminently successful. Lord Brassey shows himself a true Englishman in his aversion to our system of protection.

Concerning "Locksley Hall and the Jubilee Year of Queen Victoria" Mr. Gladstone writes in the January *Nineteenth Century* much more hopefully than does Lord Tennyson. It was natural that there should be this contest of wits between the statesman and the poet, as much of the legislation which stirred the poet's bile occurred under the inspiration of Mr. Gladstone. The mass of mankind will sympathize with the great Liberal rather than with the great Tory. This article is valuable to all political students as exhibiting the marvelous progress of the English people toward that democracy which Americans believe to be the surest guarantee of liberty and progress. Political students and lovers of historical inquiry will find much to please, stimulate, and satisfy in this paper. Under the quaint title "Bishops and Sisters-in-law," Lord Bramwell discusses the old question, Can a man lawfully marry his deceased wife's sister? In answering the Bishop of Oxford, he shows the hardship and cruelty which the law of England puts upon two persons who have everything to lead them to marry but the existence of the law, and also shows how the present English law upon the subject, which is only maintained by the influence of the House of Lords, puts a premium upon social misconduct. Lord Bramwell declares absolutely that there is no prohibition of such a marriage in the New or Old Testament. The law lord seems to have a large advantage in this article over the spiritual lord. The question has little interest for America, where such marriages have been from time immemorial permitted, beyond the illustration which the discussion gives of the curious conservatism of the English clerical mind. It is a very singular fact that some of the English colonies do not accept the English prohibition of marriage with a deceased wife's sister, so that such a marriage is legal in the colonies of the British crown while illegal in England itself; and it is a fact that some eminent persons have temporarily emigrated in order to be married under colonial law and have suffered very little if any social disadvantage from that fact at home.

George J. Romane seems to be the accepted heir of a large part of Mr. Darwin's intelligence and scientific influence. His paper on "Physiological Selection" in this number is a defense of the hypothesis which the author presented to the Linnæan Society, which conveyed an additional and important suggestion on the origin of species, and to which he gave the title of "Physiological Selection." It was put forward as a hypothesis requiring a long and arduous work of verification. The author has learned that there is no bigotry more intense and persistent than scientific bigotry, for the storm of attack and criticism has been visited upon him, with the result that he thinks more highly than ever of the proba-

bility of the suggestion. The underlying facts which led the author to assert the inadequacy of natural selection form three distinct heads of evidence: the inutility to species of a large number of their specific characteristics; the general fact of sterility between allied species; the swamping influence upon even useful variations of free intercrossing with the parent form. Those who study this paper will see that the objections which have been raised by theologians with regard to Darwin's theories find unexpected re-enforcement from one who accepts those theories so far as the facts warrant.

The second article of Bishop Dudley, of Kentucky, on "Why I am a Churchman," in the December *North American*, abundantly illustrates the difficult position in which those are placed who undertake to defend the authority of a Church which encourages mutually destructive doctrines. Truth is liberal only as it allies itself to all other things which are true, but truth is exclusive toward all things which are false. We have long been astonished at the ignorance of men who claim by their very position to be intelligent, and never more so than to find this writer using such a sentence as this: "No confession is demanded by the Protestant Episcopal Church in the secrecy of the confessional box or in the noisy excitement of the class-room." There has never been a time in the history of Methodism when the class-room has been held to be in any sense a confessional, or when confession has been invited or even approved, and yet we suppose for some generations men who are filled with the bigotry of indifference will be making that assertion. It seems a strange thing also that one in the eminent position of a Christian bishop should call attention to the fact, as a merit in his Church, that neither in the liturgy nor in the Articles is there presented any theory of the nature and operation of the Holy Sacrament; and it is absolutely certain that a view of the holy sacrament which makes it substantially the Roman mass cannot be true if it can also be taught that it is a solemn memorial whose value to the recipient is wholly dependent upon the religious state of the communicant. Both these views cannot possibly be true, and it is no merit in a Church to allow the two views to exist side by side with their corresponding practices. One is exclusive of the other. Quoting from the work of Rev. Heman R. Timlow on "Divers Orders of Ministers in the Scriptures," we find Bishop Dudley attempting to prove that episcopacy, substantially as it now is, appeared so close to the apostolic times as to create an assumption that it was created by apostolic authority, and he quotes Drs. Schaff and Fisher and others as admitting the early appearance of the bishop in a place of authority. No one is disposed to discredit these admissions, but they are to be taken only for what they are worth, and it by no means amounts to the doctrine of Apostolic Succession. They simply show that there was a superintending and authoritative office in the Church, sometimes exercised over an individual church or a group of churches, very much as in the Presbyterian Church of to-day the pastoral authority of Dr. John Hall extends over the mother Church and over the mission churches which are sustained by the liberality of his congregation.

But this forms a very flimsy basis for the tremendous structure which is raised upon it by all those who defend the doctrine of Apostolic Succession; and it is plain also from the *Teachings of the Twelve Apostles*—that most unwelcome document to all who maintain the Roman teaching as to the authority of bishops—that in the middle of the second century the churches were exhorted to appoint themselves “bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord,” the power of appointing bishops and deacons residing in the church and not in the bishop; and in this same section counsel is given with regard to the measure of respect due to them, which is utterly inconsistent with the idea that their place was already assured and their functions declared. Their service is that of prophets and teachers (see line 280). The injunctions about baptism, prayer, eucharistic service, breaking of bread on the Lord’s day, reproof and discipline are addressed to Christians as such, and not to those who receive authority by ordination. Apostle and prophet are the names given to traveling teachers; they are not carefully discriminated. A prophet was not necessarily an apostle; an apostle was a prophet. An apostle might not remain more than two days in one place; a prophet might stay in any community, yet a community might be without a prophet. The eucharist itself is not described. If the Lord’s Supper had, as the Romanist and Romanizing ministers declare, from the first the quality of a mass, and if this was, as they claim, the central act of worship, it is impossible that such Christian society as is indicated in the “Teaching” should have been owned and acknowledged, as it plainly was, as a true Christian Church.

The literature of the War receives a further addition in this number by the printing of a posthumous military autobiography by General Garfield on his campaign in East Kentucky, which had such large influence in holding that State to the Union. Gail Hamilton, who usually dips her pen in acid, writing of “Heathendom and Christendom,” accomplishes a sweeter-tempered paper than is common with her, yet it is not without traces of the old-time pungency. The writer illustrates for the thousandth time the immense difficulties into which thoughtful people are plunged by their Calvinistic education, if not by the survival of their Calvinistic faith.

The January number of this *Review* has very little in it of value beyond the exposition of Swedenborgianism by Rev. James Reed, and the paper by Joseph Hewes on the question, “Are the Heathen our Inferiors?” which last is but a brief letter. The spirit of this letter is generally bad, but some of the statements with regard to the actual teaching of Jesus are forcibly put.

BOOK NOTICES.

RELIGION, THEOLOGY, AND BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

Ben-Hur. A Tale of the Christ. By LEW WALLACE, Author of the *Fair God*. 12mo, pp. 552. New York: Harper & Brothers.

THE romance of *Ben-Hur*, now in the seventh year of its career before the public, must be acknowledged the champion in the "battle of the books." It came forth unheralded—a story located in the Jewish-Roman world about the time of Christ—the work of one who, though not unknown as a patriot-soldier, enjoyed no great literary reputation, and it suffered by contrast with the many able and scholarly Lives of Christ recently published, and also by association with such abortions as *The Prince of the House of David*. It was received by the public without any acclaim, and was read by the omnivorous few; but instead of then quickly sinking out of sight and being forgotten, it was read by others, and those of another class, till it became one of the books that one might speak of with the assurance of being understood; and so each year has added to its popularity and to the extent of its sale, till now the old and battered stereotype plates have become so worn and smoothed by over-use—with more than a hundred thousand impressions—that an entire new mechanical outfit has become a necessity.

Ben-Hur is the story of a young Jew, born in Jerusalem about the time of our Lord's advent, of one of the principal families of the nation, his father being a man of great wealth, position, and culture, and a favorite of the Roman emperor. But at length, through a concurrence of disasters, the father having perished at sea, the surviving members of the family fell victims to the vengeance of the Roman governor; the mother and daughter were thrown into prison, and the youth of sixteen condemned to the galleys. After three years in that service, having rescued the commander of the fleet from drowning, he became the adopted son of one of the great men of Rome, and was trained in all the learning and arts of his class. Then he appears at Antioch, and finds in the person of a former slave of his father the wealthiest merchant in all the East. Once away from Rome, and in the atmosphere of his ancestral nation, the deathless love of the Jew for his country and race revives in him, and he solemnly devotes himself and all that he has to the rescue of his people from the yoke of the Romans. His connection with Balthasar—one of the "wise men" who brought presents to the infant Christ—and with a rich sheik from the desert opened to him an idea of the intense hatred toward Rome that prevailed through all the East, and also of the earnest expectation of the Jews that the promised Messiah was about to appear to deliver the nation and restore the throne of David. At Jerusalem he heard of a wonderful person who was going out and in among the people—a Galilean, but often visiting Jerusalem—whose teachings and power to work miracles had led many to believe in him as the hoped-for Messiah, and for a

year he mingled with the multitudes that followed the strange preacher, and became convinced that this was, indeed, the "promised hope of Israel." When Christ made his last journey to Jerusalem he followed in the train, having before prepared a vast multitude of Galileans to be on hand in Jerusalem, ready to aid in the proclamation and the coronation of their king. Then follow the scenes of the crucifixion, and the crushing out of the undeveloped rebellion. The last scenes find Ben-Hur a Christian at Rome, using his vast wealth to shield the infant Church by the preparation of the catacombs of St. Calixtus.

The two distinctive literary properties of the writing are its sustained vivacity and its fidelity to nature. The former is all-pervading and perhaps somewhat in excess, for except the very first scene, when the three wise men meet in the desert to begin their journey to Jerusalem, there is no time of quiet, or scene of idyllic loveliness. It is said that the author had never visited any of the places which he describes so graphically, and with such remarkable fidelity to the minutest details. Some of the descriptions are to the last degree exciting, and often, indeed, terrible, but every-where is—half-hidden indeed, but still a real presence—the demon of revenge, rising up against the destroyers of his father's house, and against Rome as the tyrant power that was grinding the people of God under its iron heel; and while the reader must sympathize with the hero of the tale, the sympathy itself becomes not only painful, but also hateful.

The Jewish misconception of the character of the kingdom which the Messiah was to set up is well illustrated in the ruling thoughts and purposes of Ben-Hur and his purposed action at Jerusalem; while the true and spiritual side is brought out in the words of old Balthasar, who declared that the new King of Israel would not set up his kingdom by the sword. This Ben-Hur himself came at length to understand, and also himself consciously experienced the power of that kingdom in his own character and life. At this point the author's early training and his later associations with spiritual and evangelical Christians served him a good purpose, and one is ready to ask whether it can be possible that one could so accurately indicate the facts and phenomena of the Christian life without some personal knowledge of them. We once asked that question respecting the author of *Adam Bede*, while as yet the identity of George Eliot was unknown, and the facts of the case when ascertained justified our suspicion; so we suspect that the author of *Ben-Hur* has learned the nature of the strange transformation that passed upon the character of his hero, either from personal experience or from observations made at very short range.

Old Faiths in New Light. By NEWMAN SMYTH, Author of "The Religious Feeling." Revised Edition. 12mo, pp. 391. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Dr. Newman Smyth's "Old Faiths in New Light," issued some years ago, was the signal-gun that brought on the conflict now in progress concerning the "New Theology" or "Progressive Orthodoxy," which has

accidentally found a central location at Andover Theological Seminary. The interest awakened by the discussion has caused the first edition of the book to become exhausted, and accordingly a new one is now issued, slightly enlarged and modified, but substantially the same as before. That the school of theologians represented by Dr. Smyth have broken away from their ancestral positions is well; nor is it strange that when loosed from their moorings they should occasionally drift upon shoals, although their general tendency may be from worse to better. It is good to get out of the old ruts of opinions, and to employ improved methods of thinking; it is especially so to occasionally re-examine the grounds of one's convictions—and yet the process is not wholly without peril. Even Dr. Smyth and his friends are experiencing both of these results. Let all who would study up the subject read this volume.

Lectures, Chiefly Expository, on St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. With Notes and Illustrations. By JOHN HUTCHISON, D.D. 8vo, pp. 317. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner & Welford.

This is an exceedingly pleasant book to handle, for it is not too heavy to hold in the hand while reading, and the paper and typography are such as to make the reading pleasant, even for weak eyes and in a dim light. The matter, too, is alluring, for it is learned without pedantry, and devout without narrowness or acridity. There are here twenty-four lectures, not long, of course, as the size of the book shows, each employing and expounding, with "improvements," a paragraph of the epistle, and, all together, pretty fairly taking in the whole substance of the document. The matter is good—plain, forcible, evangelical truth, filled with the unction of grace, yet learned, critical, and eminently doctrinal in either sense of that term. The author is somewhat known by his two formerly published works of much the same character with this—a *Commentary on the Epistles to the Thessalonians*, and another on *Our Lord's Messages to the Seven Churches of Asia*. He has also contributed pretty liberally to some of the better class of religious periodicals. This will be a worthy companion to those, and the whole will prove helpful to devout and teachable readers.

The Parables of Our Saviour Expounded and Illustrated. By WILLIAM M. TAYLOR, D.D., LL.D., Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York. 12mo, pp. 445. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son.

The parables delivered by Christ are an unfailing fountain of the very best style of spiritual instruction. They have been expounded and applied, and their teachings "improved" by many hands, and no doubt they will continue to afford matter for religious teaching in all the future, for what may have been before said does not supersede what may still be further set forth. The author of this volume is well known as one peculiarly adapted to this style of writing; and although he has heretofore written and published many excellent works, it may be doubted whether any other has been better than this. It will prove an excellent Sabbath companion for the Christian deprived of the privileges of the sanctuary.

The Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuchal Codes. By GUARDUS VOS, Fellow of Princeton Theological Seminary. With an Introduction by Professor WILLIAM HENRY GREEN. 12mo, pp. 263. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son.

This work, we are told, was first prepared as a thesis in competition for the Hebrew fellowship at Princeton, and was accepted as entitling its author to the place to which he aspired. It is simply a restatement in concise forms of the chief arguments that have been offered in answer to the destructive criticism of Graf, Wellhausen, and Kuenen, and reproduced in English by Robertson Smith. A pretty full epitome of the whole argument is given; the learning and the force of the opposers are conceded, and the whole subject is discussed as if something may be said on both sides; and, while the writer succeeds in the defense of all that is really valuable in his position, yet he yields not a few points that were held by the older class of biblical scholars. This volume has the advantage of giving the gist of the whole argument in a form so condensed that it may be available for others besides specialists. No doubt this whole subject will have to be re-examined and largely restated; some indefensible outposts will be given up, but the citadel will stand sure.

The Transfiguration of Christ. By FRANK WAKELEY GUNSAULUS. 18mo, pp. 267. Boston & New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

A volume made up of eight chapters, or meditations, built up about the facts and incidents of the Transfiguration. There is a fair display of biblical learning, but not much to enhance the stores of exegesis, or to illustrate biblical truth and doctrine.

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND TOPOGRAPHY.

Essays, Reviews, and Discourses. By DANIEL D. WHEDON, D.D., LL.D., Author of *The Freedom of the Will*, etc. With a Biographical Sketch. Edited by his son, J. S. WHEDON, M.A., and his nephew, D. A. WHEDON, S.T.D. 12mo, pp. 352. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe.

Statements: Theological and Critical. By DANIEL D. WHEDON, D.D., LL.D. 12mo, pp. 400. (Same Editors and Publishers.)

At the close of Dr. Whedon's long and fruitful literary career, which was so soon followed by his decease, his surviving friends, and both the Methodist and the general public, had a right to expect that a selection from his multifarious writings, scattered so very widely in periodical and other temporary publications, would be made, and put in a permanent form. We accordingly urged the performance of that service upon the members of his family, whose well-known fitness for the work was a sufficient guarantee that if undertaken by them it would be well done. The accomplished results are seen in the two handsome volumes whose titles are given above. Of the skill and ability displayed by the editors much might be justly said. We will, however, only remark that their rather difficult and delicate task seems to have been performed with both tact and judgment, judiciously and conscientiously. The prefixed "Bio-

graphical Sketch," covering nearly fifty pages, is executed in good taste, sufficiently full, moderately eulogistical, but not unduly laudatory.

The first volume is largely made up of Dr. Whedon's more extended discussions of philosophical, theological, and ecclesiological themes. The first class are distinctly Christian, in opposition to the falsely so-called "liberal" philosophy of the day, which is, however, virtually non-theistic and agnostic. The theological portions are, for the most part, moderately polemical, and designed to set forth and defend Arminianism as opposed to Calvinism. The essays on ecclesiastical subjects are mostly devoted to the statement and defense of the author's views respecting Church polity, and especially that of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

The second volume is more diversified in the subjects discussed, and also less systematically elaborated, and the pieces are generally much briefer and more compactly written. The matter has been gleaned, for the most part, from the editorial remarks scattered through the successive issues of the *Methodist Quarterly Review*—often from "Book Notices"—made during the twenty-eight years of the author's editorship of that publication. The work devolved upon the editors in making up this part of the work was one of peculiar difficulty, in respect to the including and excluding of portions of the over-abundant material from which the selection was to be made; and while some may think that they have occasionally erred in both directions, the impartial reader, if competent to judge in the case, will find much less to censure than to approve in the performance.

Dr. Whedon was a man of decided opinions, and he always had the "courage of his convictions;" and, because he possessed the ability to state his positions very clearly, he seldom failed to make manifest his slightest variations from his readers' preconceptions, so many times bringing him into intellectual antagonisms. He was especially inexpert in respect to the convenient indefiniteness of conception and exposition in which others have excelled—and which is not altogether an unmixed evil; neither in framing our own system of beliefs, nor especially in formulating a concord of opinions for associate bodies, in the form of "confessions."

The editor of a denominational "review" becomes, by virtue of his position, an expositor of the distinctive opinions and views of his denomination on all doctrinal and ecclesiastical matters, according to his conception of them, and Dr. Whedon was not the man to hesitate in respect to the responsibilities of his position. He found himself forced into a kind of championship of Methodist theology, in defending which he was often called to define it; and just here was the peril of the proceeding. He was an Arminian, as are all Methodist theologians; but there are Arminians and Arminians, and, with his peculiarly logical habits of thinking, Dr. Whedon was pretty sure to follow out the first postulates of his system to possibly perilous results. He accordingly developed a sub-species of philosophic theology differing in some important points from that taught in the usually accepted standards of Methodist theology. These views he presented very clearly and defended with both skill and force; and while probably

they will not be of long continuance, yet they are well worth one's study, if for nothing else than as specimens of theological philosophizing.

He also became the champion of a specific form of Methodist ecclesiasticism in respect to the nature of the Methodist episcopacy. How thoroughly he elaborated his views on that subject, and how he had a not inconsiderable following, for a time, is well known; and his literary executors have done the right thing in perpetuating his discussions in these volumes. But that either he failed to convince the Church generally of the correctness of his peculiar views, or else the conviction ran its course and died out while he was yet at his desk, is seen in the fact that, just as his official term was ending, the General Conference, by its formal action, asserted another and incompatible theory of its episcopacy.

All through the twenty-eight years of the *Review* while conducted by Dr. Whedon are found usually brief, but always incisive, remarks and suggestions upon one and another subject in the domain of Christian eschatology. The destructive madness of the Millerite "craze" (1840-45) called his attention to the subject of the Second Advent and the Millennium, and led him to publish his strong arguments in opposition to all specifically chiliastic views. In his view the millennium cannot be brought in until the Gospel shall have prevailed over all the earth, and then its period will not be bounded by such lines as are constructed by a literal and mathematical interpretation of a single and not-well-understood passage in the Bible. His discussions of this class of subjects, filling the last fifty pages of the second volume, are able and ingenious, and always reverent and deferential to the traditional beliefs; but their careful consideration will be likely to leave the impression that the last words have not yet been spoken.

For more than fifty years Dr. Whedon was a living, active force in the thought of the age, and especially so in Methodism, to whose interests he devoted his best energies with unfaltering fidelity. His work will live after him—chiefly in the intellectual and spiritual characters of future generations, but also, it may be hoped, through his writings, to which these goodly volumes make the final contribution.

History of Mediæval Art. By Dr. FRANZ VON REBER, Director of the Bavarian Royal Galleries, etc. Translated by JOSEPH THATCHER CLARKE. With 422 Illustrations, and a Glossary of Technical Terms. 8vo, pp. 743. New York: Harper & Brothers.

The revived and growing popular interest in esthetic matters makes the appearance of really learned and plainly written histories of art, as it rose and flourished and decayed in former times, especially acceptable. Such a work is that now before us, which undertakes to trace the progress of the three principal forms of artistic production—painting, sculpture, and architecture—downward from the fall of the Roman Empire. Although that great catastrophe seemed to extinguish the light of former times, yet it is plain that the beginnings of Christian art were survivals of that of the Græco-Roman civilization. The Byzantine variety possessed

a kind of derived individuality of its own, which, however, never became naturalized in western Europe, nor did the Saracenic. To the present time painting, and still more sculpture, are largely affected by the classical models of Greece and Rome, and even architecture has all along felt their influence. Germany alone, of all the nations of Europe, seems to have produced original forms of art.

Christian art began in the Catacombs, and after those examples its development in the forms that still survive was slow, and very much interrupted, until its revival in Germany during the ninth and tenth centuries. But, still, German art was itself a revival of the ancient types with important modification as to its details. Its nearest approach to something really original, and that which is intrinsically its best production, is the Gothic ecclesiastical architecture.

The work before us is able, and sufficiently full for its purpose; but the author's stand-point makes it essentially a German work, treating nearly exclusively of German art, with but scant notices of that of other countries of the Continent, and almost none at all of that of England—which country, however, has not contributed much that was original to the domain of art. To all who really love the subject this volume will prove an acceptable companion as well as a worthy instructor; and it is itself a worthy contribution to the literature of art adapted to popular use.

The Provinces of the Roman Empire, from Cæsar to Diocletian. By THEODORE MOMMSEN. Translated, with the author's sanction and additions, by WILLIAM P. DICKSON, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow. With Maps by Professor KIEPERT. Two Volumes. 8vo, pp. 397, 396. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

MommSEN's *History of Rome* was issued nearly thirty years ago, and having been read and approved by two generations of scholars and general readers it has come to be recognized as a classic. It has, however, been felt that the work was incomplete because of the want of sufficiently full accounts of the affairs of Rome in the provinces, which, during the period of the empire, constituted such a very considerable part of the imperial domains. And now the veteran author comes forward with the needed complementary matter, prepared with the same painstaking and conscientious regard for the truth of history which distinguished the earlier work. The first volume is devoted to the European Provinces, the Italian Frontier, Spain, Gaul, Germany, Britain, the Danubian Provinces, Greece, and also "Asia." In the second volume are accounts of the Parthians, Syria and the Nabathæans, Judea and the Jews, Egypt, and the African Provinces, that is, Numidia and Mauritania.

These local histories sometimes present episodes of the most interesting kind, and because they often touch upon matters that affect our own times, from both religious and social relations, and also since in them are found the germs of modern ideas and institutions, their study becomes peculiarly interesting; and to these latter classes of subjects the author devotes no less attention than to political and military affairs. The work

is one with which no student of Roman history, nor indeed of later European history, can afford to be unacquainted, and these volumes will form a valuable accompaniment to the author's larger and wider work, with which they are made to conform in their material make-up.

Appleton's Cyclopædia of American Biography. Edited by JAMES GRANT WILSON and JOHN FISKE. Vol. I. Aaron—Crandall. Imperial 8vo, pp. 768. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

Something of the character indicated by the above title has long been a felt want, and we are glad that the preparation and publication of such a work has fallen into good hands. The editors are well known as at once men of wide general information and adept writers of personal sketches; and behind these, unseen by the public, is also one whose skill in book-building gives promise of good results. The plan contemplates the widest comprehension of subjects, so that the name of every person who has become conspicuous in any pursuit or calling, or achieved even a local reputation, shall appear in its pages. This fullness, of course, necessitates great brevity, and allows room for only the merest record of the chief facts of individual history, and yet it is remarkable how much may be said in so few lines. In its form and material make-up, the volume in hand is very nearly the same with the volumes of the *New Cyclopædia*, and altogether has an attractive appearance. The work will prove invaluable to all who have to do with names and dates and special facts in any department, and in no place will it be more acceptable than in an editorial office. As a personal remark, by which to do justice to all parties, it is only proper that we should say that the really excellent sketches of Bishops Coke, Asbury, and Andrew found in this volume were prepared by another hand than that to which the preparation of articles on Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church has been assigned.

The Midnight Sun. The Tsar and the Nihilist. Adventures and Observations in Norway, Sweden, and Russia. By J. M. BUCKLEY, LL.D. Illustrated. 8vo, pp. 376. Boston: D. Lothrop & Co.

Traveling in foreign lands is a valuable means of instruction to the individual, and in a greatly less degree the records of travel may be made valuable to their readers; and, because they constitute an easy and pleasant kind of reading, they are usually appreciated beyond their relative merits. Dr. Buckley wisely selected a route not already rendered familiar by the reports of annual multitudes of tourists—regions sufficiently known to render them points of interest, and yet so far unknown that further information is gladly accepted. His methods of examination and inquiry brought him an amount of knowledge of the things seen and heard quite beyond what would be gained by the average tourist. His statements appear also to be based upon the best of foundations—his own observations, or else information gained upon the spot. The descriptions of scenes and places in Russia are especially valuable because the subject is quite the opposite of hackneyed, and they will tend to whet the appe-

tite for a fuller study of the subject. The revelations respecting nihilism may be valuable as well as curious, but, like disclosures from masonic lodges or star-chamber courts, all such must be accepted as possibly correct, and probably, at best, mixed.

History of the Irish Presbyterian Church. By Rev. THOMAS HAMILTON, M.A. 12mo, pp. 192. New York: Scribner & Welford.

A series of "Hand-Books for Bible Classes and Private Students" has been in course of publication for several years past by T. & T. Clark of Edinburgh, with Rev. Marcus Dods, D.D., and Rev. Alexander Whyte, D.D., for editors; and these publications are sold in this country by Scribner & Welford. The books are chiefly devoted to religious and Church subjects, history, theology, and biblical learning, condensed into small volumes, but very full of matter. That now in hand is of their best: clearly and ably written, and as little affected by partisanship as the case will allow; for every thing Irish seems to be tinged with partisanship. The record is certainly a noble one, and the work is honorable to all concerned.

A Short History of Parliament. By B. C. SKOTTOWE, M.A., New College, Oxford. 12mo, pp. 345. New York: Harper & Brothers.

The history of the British Parliament is substantially the civil and political history of the nation for the last six hundred years. The rapid sketch here given must necessarily exclude all details, and yet, by a judicious course of selections and exclusions, it is a somewhat comprehensive record of the development and growth into a kind of autocratic omnipotence of the freest and ablest deliberative body in the world. The sketch here given is well adapted to the use of the many intelligent readers whose occupations forbid the complete mastery of so broad a subject, but who still desire to know something respecting a body of so much general interest. The book is well written, and quite fair to all parties though not without clearly marked predilections. A good book for schools or for private study.

Sir Philip Sidney. By J. A. SYMONDS, Author of *Sketch of Shelley*, etc. 12mo, pp. 186. New York: Harper & Brothers. (Mr. John Morley's *English Men of Letters*.)

The name of Sir Philip Sydney is accepted as a synonym for *chivalry* of the purest and noblest style. He was of a noble family, highly educated, learned in the literature of his times, and himself gifted as a writer of both prose and verse, a courtier and a soldier, a man of unspotted morals and of simple but earnest Christian character, and his death while yet a young man, among such peculiar conditions, has caused his name to come down to our time enveloped in a bright glamour which seems to endure through all changes. The volume here given is only a brief *résumé* of the principal events in Sidney's career, with a hasty review of his times and an estimate of his character. The often told story of his affair with the wounded soldier, after the battle at Zutphen, where Sidney received his own fatal wound, which Motley makes out to be apocryphal, is here repeated without any suggestion of want of trustworthiness.

LITERATURE AND FICTION.

Locksley Hall, Sixty Years After. By ALFRED, LORD TENNYSON. 16mo, pp. 44.
New York: Harper & Brothers. (Harper's Handy Series.)

As every body who pretends to keep pace with the literature of the present and the recent past may be supposed to know all about "*Locksley Hall*," as it came forth to the parents and grandparents of the present generation, so it is safe to assume that the same persons have not failed to familiarize themselves with its companion piece of "*Sixty Years After*," by the same hand. This way of setting old age over against youth, by comparison or contrast, seems to be a favorite fancy with some authors. We have a memorable case of the kind in Bryant's "*Thanatopsis*," written at eighteen, and his "*Flood of Years*," nearly sixty years later. The two cases of Bryant and Tennyson are, indeed, very much alike in respect to the time of life of the two authors when the two several poems of each were produced, but they have this remarkable difference: that in the case of the former the boy was sadder and less hopeful than the old man, while in the latter the gay and hopeful aspirations of early life are sadly clouded, and the present is embittered, by reason of the discovery of the fallacious character of early anticipations, while old age seems to be only faintly illuminated with hopes of the hereafter. If Bryant's death-song comes very far short of the tone and tune of the ninety-first psalm, this of Tennyson is a veritable *threnody*, and is all through attuned to the key of Ecclesiastes. Both are Christian—each in its own way—but neither of them makes any very near approach to the real Christian's assurance and joyful hope of immortality; and, while hope prevails in the former, in the latter despondency predominates.

The appearance of this poem suggests a further comparison between its author and another Englishman who is also almost exactly his coeval—the statesman, sage, and scholar of Hawarden. Gladstone and Tennyson are strictly contemporaries, and both of them are eminently representative Englishmen of the nineteenth century. They began active life at nearly the extreme opposite sides of the prevailing thought and opinions of their age and country; but while the former, who dwelt at first in an atmosphere of aristocratic exclusiveness, has tended steadily toward the developing spirit of the age, with ever-increasing confidence in God and hope for humanity, till now he is characteristically the liberal leader of his times, the latter has gone further and further in the opposite direction, till again the two stand, as at the beginning, face to face, each having gone round the half of the circle. Gladstone the commoner, who proudly refused to become a lord by royal patent, with his party in the minority in Parliament and his cause helplessly in abeyance for the time being, is still buoyant with hope for man as man, and for the whole race, because he believes in God—or, as Faber voices it, "Since God is God, the right must win;" because with him

"To doubt would be disloyalty,
To falter would be sin—"

and is satisfied to await the ripening of his purposes. Tennyson, having become a lord by royal favor, looks out upon the world and thinks he sees every thing going to the bad. The "vanity of vanities," of the pseudo-Solomonic "preacher," rings out with almost interminable variations in this new "Locksley Hall." All of Johnson's "Vanity of Human Wishes" re-appear with increased force and piquancy, and with illustrations in proof drawn not so much from individual examples as from the distinctively revolutionary tendencies of the times. Before his eyes "Celtic Demos rises a demon;" "chaos" and "cosmos" seem not to be discriminated, and the extension of the franchise is stigmatized as the "sovereignty of the plow;" and this whole career of ruin—its cause, its process, and its results—are at length sketched in a single ringing distich, that tells what "Progress" is about:

"Bring the old dark ages back without the faith, without the hope,
Break the State, the Church, the throne, and roll the ruin down the slope;"

and while lamenting the loss of the old art and beauty, "Poor old Heraldry, poor old History, poor old Poetry," he casts himself into the chaotic mass, with

"Poor old voice of eighty crying after voices that have fled,
All I loved are vanished voices, all my steps are on the dead."

This may be all very natural, and because it is true to one aspect of nature, though as a whole it is essentially untruthful, it has certain poetical capabilities. Still, the man of fourscore whose mind dwells among such scenes is truly pitiable. It is a noticeable fact that faith in God, with its resultant hopefulness, is usually attended by faith and hope in respect to humanity; while, on the contrary, doubt and uncomfortable forebodings nearly always apply alike, in the same person, to both worlds.

MISCELLANEOUS.

What Shall We Do with the Sunday-School as an Institution? By GEORGE LANSING TAYLOR, D.D. Square 16mo, pp. 46. New York: Wilbur B. Ketcham. 30 cts.

The great value, and indeed vital importance of Sunday-schools, as a department of church work second only to the preaching of the word, justifies the frequent and careful re-examination of its methods, and also all judicious attempts to harmonize these with the other forms of church activities. And that consideration is a sufficient apology for the appearance of this little book. Free discussion does not injure any really good cause, and even a little fault-finding, if done in the right spirit, may be quite the opposite of harmful. We therefore welcome this essay of Rev. Dr. Taylor as timely and calculated to do good. The controlling thought, that the Sunday-school should be made and considered an integral part of the Church's work, and not a somewhat separate auxiliary, is good and very important; but since it is not entirely so, the practical question may be

whether it is not better to endure existing infelicities rather than adopt or attempt to execute measures that must call for radical changes. The faults and causes of weakness in the Sunday-school as it is are at once obvious and formidable; but still the work it does is incalculably valuable, and for that reason only headlong reformers will consent to see it very much changed until it shall be shown that an alternative scheme is prepared, and ready for immediate use, which shall surely obviate the present infelicities of method without endangering any real excellence. On all these points this essay will prove helpful by what it suggests not less than what it declares.

The Life of Christ in the World: Sermons. By REV. ARTHUR BROOKS, Rector of the Church of the Incarnation, New York. 12mo, pp. 360. New York: Thomas Whittaker. Price, \$1 50.

These are carefully written discourses—twenty-five in number—on themes such as thoughtful persons like to dwell upon. The "Life of Christ" here spoken of is not the physical and visible life in which he was known in the days of his incarnation, but his inward, spiritual life, that lives on especially in the hearts of his people. This is indicated by the titles of some of the sermons, as, "The Message of Christ to the Conscience," "God the Power of Man's Social Life," "The Sifting of Life," etc. The tone and spirit are good and wholesome, the composition is suitable to the character of the work; and though, while in the form of sermons, they have largely the character of elaborate essays, that fact is not against them.

The Anatomy of Negation. By EDGAR SALTUS. 12mo, pp. 226. New York: Scribner & Welford.

To deny is the least difficult of all mental processes, and often it requires the best efforts of the strong and wise man to effectually antagonize the caviling of a fool. It is for that reason that mere negation is found to be so tenacious of life, and that defenses of whatever is positive must be wrought out by well-sustained arguments. The author of the little volume named above undertakes the task of showing what has been the history of negativism in religion in all the past, and to demonstrate its identity in its ever-changing forms. And yet under most systems of negation there has lurked a modicum of truth, which has given a measure of stability to the superimposed falsehood. The rapid sketch of religious untruth, extending from Buddha to the latest time, will serve to illustrate the futile efforts of human reason untaught by the Higher Reason to attain to the truth, and the indestructibleness of the persuasion that there is reality in that for which souls instinctively yearn.

The Life of Rev. John Wesley, A.M. Written from a Spiritual Stand-point. With five Illustrations. By REV. EDWARD DAVIES, Author of the *Life of Bishop Taylor*, etc. Introduction by Dr. CHARLES CULLIS. 18mo (paper), pp. 261. Holiness Book Concern, Reading, Mass.

Wesley's biography seems to be an inexhaustible resource for religious instruction and edification. The number of his Lives is "legion." This one may be read with profit.

About Money and Other Things. A Gift Book. By the Author of *John Halifax, Gentleman*. 12mo, pp. 234. New York: Harper & Brothers.

The author of *John Halifax* is one of the characters who will not get out of the way; so, though she is remembered by a few as the friend of "auld lang syne," she still persists in making herself heard, and the people like to hear her. The present volume is made up of reprinted articles. That "About Money" is only one of ten, of about equal length. They are good, well-written, and readable.

Some Problems of Philosophy. By ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER, Professor of Philosophy in Columbia College. 16mo, pp. 170. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

There are known to be not a few problems in the realm of metaphysics which have been recognized by thinkers in all ages, but which are now as far from settlement as when they were first propounded. More than a dozen of these, including the most celebrated, are discussed in this little book with a good share of acuteness, and with the usual results, or, rather, lack of results. The exercise of such studies is wholesome, though the game is much like that of battledoor and shuttlecock.

Morning Family Prayers for a Year. Founded on Select Passages of Scripture from the Old and New Testaments. By J. R. MACDUFF, D.D. 12mo, pp. 598. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers.

Written and printed forms of prayer have a place in religious and devotional literature. They are valuable for private reading and meditation, and are not to be despised for family use. Ministers might study them as aids to greater fullness and richness in their public exercises; for good praying is scarcely less helpful to the people than good preaching, and some good preachers are not good pray-ers. The prayers that make up this volume are thoughtful rather than worshipful, stately rather than tender, but reverent in tone and suggestive of motives to devotion.

Haifa; or, Life in Modern Palestine. By LAWRENCE OLIPHANT, Author of *The Land of Gilead*, etc. Edited, with Introduction, by CHARLES A. DANA. 12mo, pp. 369. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Books on Palestine seldom fail to command a deep and abiding interest, and especially when, as in this case, they are the works of actual observers who unite the keen preceptions of the practiced traveler with the literary skill of the accomplished book-maker. Mr. Oliphant lived among the scenes that he described, and evidently his heart not less than his understanding entered into the descriptions given. The brief introduction by Mr. Dana very handsomely presents the work, without attempting to either anticipate or summarize it.

True Words for Brave Men. By CHARLES KINGSLEY, Late Rector of Eversley, etc. 16mo, pp. 246. New York: Thomas Whittaker (Bible House).

It is a good thing to read Kingsley as a mental tonic and stimulus; for there is also a decided dash of the moral element in the draught. This little volume is made up of selections, brief sermons, with not much of the ordinary sermonic form or style. It is a good book, especially adapted to teach the young man wisdom.

Our Youth. A Paper for Young People and their Teachers; published every Week. J. H. VINCENT, D.D., Editor. Vol. 2, June 5, 1886, to November 27, 1886. 4to, pp. 416. New York: Phillips & Hunt.

The second volume (bound) of *Our Youth* continues to justify all the commendations that we gave to its predecessor six months ago; and some of the betterments we then suggested seem to find place in increasing degrees as the work grows older. We are glad to learn that it is meeting, in its circulation, with a share of the success that it deserves.

From the Forecastle to the Cabin. By Captain S. SAMUELS. Illustrated. 12mo. pp. 308. New York: Harper & Brothers.

This is said to be no fiction, but a genuine life-sketch of a remarkable man who actually accomplished the transition indicated in the title. It is quite well written, is full of force and vivacity, and shows its hero to have been a real man. But the story of his boy-life was quite the opposite of commendable, and the work as a whole is not without its exceptional features.

The Last Week with Jesus. By T. J. MCCONNELL, A.M. 18mo, pp. 219. Nashville: Southern Methodist Publishing House.

The subject of this little book has been often treated, but it is always fresh, and cannot be exhausted or rendered insipid. The story of those eventful days is here rehearsed with devout reflections and suggestive meditations, tending to lead the hearts of believers into a qualified form of fellowship with Christ's sufferings.

Retrospections of America, 1797-1811. By JOHN BERNARD, Author of *Retrospections of the Stage*, etc. Edited from the Manuscript by Mrs. BAYLE BERNARD. With Introduction and Notes. 12mo, pp. 380. New York: Harper & Brothers.

A collection of decidedly lively sketches of the celebrities of the American stage of three quarters of a century ago,—now forgotten.

Out of the Tolls. By JOHN W. SPEER, Author of *Grace Winslow*, etc. 12mo, pp. 389. New York: Phillips & Hunt.

HARPER'S HANDY SERIES. (Latest Issues.)—110. *Britta*. Illustrated. By GEORGE TEMPLE.—111. *A Child of the Revolution*. By the Author of *Mademoiselle Mori*. Illustrated.—112. *A Strange Inheritance*. By SKENE.—113. *Locksley Hall*, etc. By TENNYSON.—114. *Regimental Legions*. By J. S. WINTER.—115. *Yeast*. By CHARLES KINGSLEY.—116. *Cranford*. By Mrs. GASKELL.—117. *Lucy Crofton*. By Mrs. OLIPHANT.—118. *Mignon's Secret, and Wanted—A Wife*. By J. S. WINTER.—119. *Samuel Johnson*. By LESLIE STEPHEN.—120. *Edward Gibbon*. By J. C. MORISON.

HARPER'S FRANKLIN SQUARE LIBRARY. (Latest Issues.)—559. *John Westacott*. By JAMES BAKER.—560. *The Girl in the Brown Habit*. By Mrs. EDWARD KENNARD.—561. *Dorothy Forster*. By WALTER BESANT.—562. *Devon Boys*. By GEORGE MANVILLE FENN. Illustrated.—563. *A Near Relation*. By CHRISTABEL R. COLERIDGE.—564. *Elizabeth's Fortune*. By Miss BERTHA THOMAS.—565. *Gladys Fane*. By T. WEMYSS REID.—566. *The Fawcetts and Garods*. By SAIMATH.—567. *Jess*. By H. RIDER HAGGARD.—568. *Springhaven*. By R. D. BLACKMORE. Illustrated.—569. *The Merry Men, Will o' the Mill, Markheim, Thrawn Janet, Otalia and The Treasure of Franchard*. By R. L. STEVENSON.—570. *Kidnapped, The Strange Case of Dr. J. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, and Treasure Island*. By R. L. STEVENSON.

